

APPENDIX

H

Public
Outreach

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction.....	H-1
Framework.....	H-1
Public Participation and Outreach Program	H-1
Public Outreach Implementation.....	H-2
Communication and Media Relations	H-2
Public Outreach Results.....	H-3
Outreach Activities by Subregion.....	H-4
Index to Public Comments & Responses for the 2004 RTP	H-10
Response to Comments	H-15

PUBLIC OUTREACH

1. Introduction

The public outreach and participation effort for the 2004 Regional Transportation Plan has been uniquely integrated with the overall SCAG Communications Strategy and with outreach for other major SCAG planning programs. This approach has helped to assure that participants in the transportation planning process better understand the context of the process, the numerous factors that influence the process, such as growth, the economy, and the environment, and the specific role of SCAG. The approach has also been characterized by a greater level of involvement on the part of SCAG elected officials and staff than in prior outreach efforts.

2. Framework

As a metropolitan planning organization (MPO), SCAG is required to implement a public involvement process to provide complete information, timely public notice and full public access to key decisions and to support early and continuing public involvement in developing its regional plans. This is in accordance with Section 450.316(b) of the federal metropolitan planning regulations. SCAG formally adopted a Public Participation Program in September 1993. Further, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and associated regulations and policies, including President Clinton's 1994 Executive Order 12898 on Environmental Justice, seek to assure minority and low-income populations are involved in the regional planning process.

3. Public Participation and Outreach Program

SCAG's multi-pronged Public Participation and Outreach Program has included the following:

- Presentations to established organizations on the RTP throughout the region by SCAG elected officials, subregional representatives, staff, and program consultants
- Specific public workshops on the RTP throughout the region
- Assistance with outreach from subregional organizations
- Direct outreach to the leadership and membership of environmental justice and related activist groups
- Development of written and visual material to communicate the status and content of the RTP, including newsletter articles, fact sheets and PowerPoint presentations
- An on-line public comment form used throughout the outreach program
- "Branding" of the 2004 RTP as "Destination 2030" to aid in public understanding of the nature and scope of the plan
- SCAG's website featuring the Draft 2004 RTP, including public meeting notices and the latest written information on the RTP
- Spanish translations of fact sheets, the executive summary of the RTP, and key portions of the Environmental Impact Report for the RTP
- Advertising support and media outreach (including press conferences) for the RTP Draft throughout the region.

A unique additional aspect of outreach for the 2004 Regional Transportation Plan was the Southern California Compass growth visioning program. In addition to the above outreach efforts, nearly 1,000 community members, including city staff and elected officials, counties, business, environmental and community leaders, and the public at large, participated in a series of workshops in which they expressed opinions about how the region should grow. The initial regional vision identified through this effort was of a more compact development pattern that influenced the choice of the preferred 2004 RTP.

4. Public Outreach Implementation

In early 2003, an internal staff team was assembled to guide the strategy of outreach for Destination 2030 in conjunction with other major related SCAG planning initiatives, including the Maglev program and the Compass growth visioning effort. This team set up presentations on the RTP to audiences including local elected officials, subregional organizations, county transportation commissions, business organizations, and a variety of other community groups. Materials including PowerPoint presentations, Fact Sheets, and an on-line public comment form were developed. Presentations were made by SCAG elected officials, senior staff, and program consultants.

At the same time, the planning process for the RTP proceeded through the meetings and decisions of SCAG Task Forces, including the Highway and Finance Task Force, the Maglev Task Force, Aviation Task Force, Goods Movement Advisory Committee, and Regional Transit Task Force. Each of these meetings and decision processes was open to the public and included opportunities for public comment. SCAG also continued its extensive, ongoing interagency consultation processes with other transportation and air quality agencies.

As the draft RTP reached completion, a series of public workshops were scheduled. Each workshop provided a brief opening presentation on the RTP, time for attendees to speak with staff and view stations displaying materials on the plan elements, such as highway projects or financing, and a period for recorded oral public comment (as well as materials for written comments). A total of ten workshops were held, and at least one workshop was held in each of the six SCAG counties. (The workshops are identified in the list of events by subregion at the end of this Appendix.)

Environmental Justice

To meet Environmental Justice requirements and public expectations, SCAG conducted targeted outreach to environmental justice groups. Staff participated in local planning processes with environmental justice implications and provided RTP materials at a series of regional environmental justice workshops sponsored by South Coast Air Quality Management District, thus reaching interested communities and groups throughout the region. Staff also made targeted presentations on the RTP and environmental justice analyses to meetings of the leadership of local environmental and environmental justice organizations. Key RTP and Environmental Impact Report materials were translated into Spanish and posted on SCAG's web site to assure accessibility of information to the largest group of non-English speakers in the region.

5. Communication and Media Relations

Following adoption by the Regional Council on November 7, 2002 and revised August 29, 2003, SCAG has implemented a communications strategy to raise the awareness and understanding of the general public about SCAG's mission, programs, plans and policies. Goals of the communications strategy include:

- Establishing and effectively communicating the importance of regional governance and of employing regional solutions to Southern California's many policy challenges;
- Improving communications with member local governments and other key stakeholder audiences;
- Enhancing SCAG's profile with the news media and others who influence and shape policies that affect the Southern California region through proper branding or positioning and effective public relations, government affairs, community outreach and member relations programs and activities;
- Supporting and supplementing outreach efforts through (1) effective media relations; (2) outreach to local governments, community organizations, environmental justice groups, business organizations, labor organizations, faith-based organizations, environmental groups, academic groups, civic groups,

Native American Tribal Councils, and minority organizations; (3) materials development and review; and (4) other communications activities.

- Satisfy the public outreach and participation requirements, including environmental justice obligations, of major SCAG planning efforts.

The communications strategy includes media relations with electronic and print media sources, communication tools including a quarterly newsletter, an annual report, the SCAG web site, and on-going presentations and workshops to cities, counties, community groups, business groups, environmental groups and other public interest groups.

SCAG's communication strategy was integrated with the RTP outreach program by emphasizing the RTP update process, schedule of activities and other related events. Examples include:

- SCAG Vision newsletter cover story highlighted the challenges facing the region over the next 25 years, provided an overview of the RTP recommendations, included a summary of the growth visioning concept, identified potential funding sources, and encouraged public comment and participation;
- Media advisories and press releases announced the draft plan release as well as significance of the plan and encouraged public participation;
- Press conferences were conducted with both the general media and ethnic media;
- Editorial board meetings were scheduled at key newspaper outlets;
- RTP presentations were conducted on public affairs talk shows on radio and television;
- RTP events were placed in local newspaper community calendars and electronically transmitted through various organizational mailing lists;
- The draft RTP was prominently placed on SCAG's web site for public review. In addition, the public was encouraged to get involved by completing an on-line survey on regional issues, submitting comments via the public participation form and reviewing the calendar of events highlighting upcoming RTP presentations and workshops.

As a result of SCAG's media relations activities, there were hundreds of news articles regarding the RTP in electronic and print media outlets throughout the region, including ethnic media. In addition, the release of the RTP was picked up by the Associated Press which resulted in coverage beyond this region.

6. Public Outreach Results

As of the adoption of the final RTP, the following had been accomplished:

- Almost 250 public outreach events in total, reaching about 5,000 participants, including events on Destination 2030, general presentations about SCAG, and several events related to Southern California Compass;
- Immediately following the media rollout of Destination 2030, coverage by four television and two radio stations, as well as fifteen local newspapers & news services;
- In total, approximately 300 press articles about various aspects of the Regional Transportation Plan;
- A total of ten public workshops pre- and post-draft, with typical attendance of 20-30 people, with at least one workshop in each of SCAG's six counties;
- About fifteen events targeted to environmental justice audiences;
- Ten fact sheets about SCAG and specific programs (e.g., Aviation, Goods Movement, etc.) in English and Spanish;
- Nine oral commenters at the joint public hearing for the 2004 RTP and the Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) for the RTP;
- Nearly 100 documented public comments received pre-draft;
- A total of 180 letters with 900 individual comments received on the Draft RTP (more than for the 2001 RTP); and a total of 40 letters with 300 individual comments received on the PEIR.

The 2004 RTP Response to Comments is included at the end of this Appendix. The following media clips, including print media, radio, and television, were documented over the course of development of the 2004 RTP and are available on request from SCAG:

- Destination 2030 Launch, October 2003 (24 clips)
- Outreach-Specific, May 2003 – February 2004 (55 clips)
- Traffic Congestion/Air Quality, May 2003 – March 2004 (74 clips)
- Transportation Funding, May 2003 – March 2004 (22 clips)
- Goods Movement, June 2003 – March 2004 (34 clips)
- Maglev, May 2003 – March 2004 (27 clips)
- Aviation, June 2003 – February 2004 (36 clips)
- Growth, May 2003 – February 2004 (40 clips)

7. Outreach Activities by Subregion

The following list enumerates the outreach activities conducted geographically within each subregion as indicated, as of April 1, 2004.

Arroyo Verdugo Cities

1. February 19, 2003 - LA and San Gabriel Valley Watershed Council Stakeholder Committee
2. May 29, 2003 - State of Region presentation to the Rotary Club of Glendale
3. September 03, 2003 - South Coast AQMD Environmental Justice Workshop
4. September 15, 2003 - Destination 2030 Presentation to Arroyo Verdugo Steering Committee
5. September 22, 2003 - Dest 2030/RTP Presentation to Glendale Transportation & Parking Commission
6. October 21, 2003 - Destination 2030/RTP Presentation to Glendale City Council
7. October 28, 2003 - Dest 2030 Presentation to Burbank City Council
8. November 05, 2003 - Destination 2030 / RTP Presentation to South Pasadena City Council
9. December 15, 2003 - Compass Technical Review Session at Glendale--Arroyo Verdugo

City of Los Angeles

1. February 04, 2003 - Caltrans Workshop on California Transportation Plan
2. February 18, 2003 - Central Cities Association, Los Angeles
3. February 18, 2003 - Livable Communities Council
4. February 19, 2003 - LA County MTA Plans and Programs Committee, Compass presentation
5. February 24, 2003 - Center for Govt and Public Policy Studies, Compass presentation
6. February 25, 2003 - USC Career Roundtable for Master's in Planning Students
7. March 07, 2003 - So Calif Assn of Non-Profit Housing
8. March 12, 2003 - Transportation Improvement Program Workshop, held at Access Services
9. March 13, 2003 - LADOT Board of Transportation Commissioners
10. March 13, 2003 - Presentation on housing needs in region given by Joe Carreras and USC Prof. Dowell Myers
11. May 08, 2003 - Compass Workshop -- Southern California Leadership Network
12. May 21, 2003 - Compass Workshop Cal State Northridge
13. May 23, 2003 - RTP Presentation at SCAG
14. June 02, 2003 - USC Demographic Workshop - "How balanced is California's Growth? Population, Housing, and Employment"
15. June 12, 2003 - Presentation to Policy Class, USC
16. July 08, 2003 - South Coast AQMD Env. Justice Training Workshop
17. July 09, 2003 - Valley Industry & Commerce Ass'n., RTP Presentation
18. July 10, 2003 - Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce, Transportation, Water & Infrastructure Committee
19. July 15, 2003 - Central City Association, Transportation Committee, RTP presentation
20. July 21, 2003 - Valley Vote: Regional Transportation Plan Presentation

21. August 07, 2003 - West Coast Corridor Coalition Summer Roundtable Series
22. August 08, 2003 - Metrolink Board - Operation Jump-Start Presentation
23. August 16, 2003 - South Coast AQMD Environmental Justice Training Workshop
24. August 20, 2003 - LA MTA Planning Committee - Operation Jump-Start
25. September 03, 2003 - North County Traffic Forum
26. September 25, 2003 - Envisioning California Conference
27. October 11, 2003 - Southern California Transit Advocates
28. October 21, 2003 - Dest 2030 Presentation to Physicians for Social Responsibility
29. October 23, 2003 - LA Transportation Board Meeting
30. October 24, 2003 - LA Area Chamber LAX Master Plan Task Force
31. November 03, 2003 - Caltrans District 7 Management Staff Monthly Meeting
32. November 05, 2003 - Destination 2030 Public Meeting in SF Valley
33. November 18, 2003 - Destination 2030 Presentation to Porter Ranch Neighborhood Council
34. November 19, 2003 - Destination 2030 Meeting with LADOT Staff
35. November 19, 2003 - UCLA Fall Speakers Panel
36. November 20, 2003 - Presentation to Environmental Justice Groups (Monthly Lunch Meeting)
37. November 21, 2003 - Transportation Agency CEO Meeting
38. December 08, 2003 - Destination 2030 Public Meeting in San Fernando Valley
39. December 11, 2003 - Compass Peer Review Meeting
40. December 16, 2003 - Compass Technical Review Session at City of Los Angeles
41. December 30, 2003 - Wilmington Coalition for a Safe Environment-- Regional Transportation Plan
42. January 06, 2004 - Compass Technical Review Session at LA City
43. January 12, 2004 - Growth/Water Presentation at MWD
44. February 10, 2004 - RTP Informational Presentation to Studio City Homeowners' group
45. February 25, 2004 - Conformity Presentation to Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, Transportation & Infrastructure Committee

Coachella Valley Association of Governments

1. January 24, 2003 - League of Cities Desert / Mt. Div., Jim Gosnell to speak on Compass
2. May 08, 2003 - Palm Desert Board of Realtors
3. May 16, 2003 - Coachella Valley Leadership Conference
4. May 22, 2003 - Compass Public Workshop
5. August 15, 2003 - US / Mexico Sister City Convention
6. November 03, 2003 - APA -- Planners for Coachella Valley
7. November 07, 2003 - Destination 2030/RTP Presentation to Building Industry Association, Palm Springs Area
8. November 10, 2003 - Destination 2030/RTP Presentation to CVAG Transportation Committee
9. November 11, 2003 - Sierra Club Chapter
10. November 14, 2003 - Coachella Valley Association of Governments Technical Advisory Committee Meeting
11. November 14, 2003 - Destination 2030/RTP Presentation to Building Industry Association, Palm Springs Area
12. December 01, 2003 - Destination 2030/RTP Presentation to CVAG Executive Committee
13. January 06, 2004 - Destination 2030 Presentation to Desert Hot Springs City Council
14. January 08, 2004 - Compass Technical Review Session at Coachella Valley

Gateway Cities Council of Governments

1. February 08, 2003 - Society of Chinese American Aerospace Engineers
2. February 24, 2003 - Compass presentation
3. May 15, 2003 - Economic Forecast Breakfast
4. August 06, 2003 - Gateway Cities COG Board - RTP Presentation
5. November 18, 2003 - Whittier Sunrise Rotary Club
6. November 04, 2003 - Communities for a Better Environment
7. November 14, 2003 - Destination 2030/RTP Presentation to Building Industry Association, Palm Springs Area
8. December 03, 2003 - Destination 2030 Presentation to Gateway COG Transit Committee

9. January 07, 2004 - Compass Technical Review Session at Cerritos--Gateway Cities
10. January 13, 2004 - Destination 2030 Presentation to Long Beach City Council

Imperial Valley Association of Governments

1. March 20, 2003 - City County Manager's Assoc. in Imperial Co.
2. May 09, 2003 - Compass Workshop - Imperial County Office
3. September 10, 2003 - Destination 2030 Presentation to IVAG Management Committee
4. September 24, 2003 - Destination 2030 Workshop for Imperial County
5. October 22, 2003 - Destination 2030 Presentation to IVAG Regional Council
6. December 15, 2003 - Caltrans District 11 Executive Team Weekly Meeting
7. January 28, 2004 - Imperial Valley Economic Development Summit

Las Virgenes Malibu Council of Governments

1. January 28, 2003 - Las Virgenes-Malibu COG meeting
2. October 21, 2003 - Destination 2030 Presentation to LVMCOG
3. November 18, 2003 - Destination 2030 Public Meeting in SF Valley
4. December 16, 2003 - Compass Technical Review Session at Las Virgenes Malibu

North Los Angeles County

1. May 10, 2003 - Compass Workshop - Antelope Valley
2. May 12, 2003 - Discussion of PILUT Scenario 2, SANBAG, North LA County, SCAG
3. May 21, 2003 - Compass Workshop - Antelope Valley
4. June 19, 2003 - Meeting on 5th Ring with Palmdale Area Elected Officials
5. August 21, 2003 - Greater Antelope Valley Economic Alliance
6. September 15, 2003 - Destination 2030 Presentation to North LA County Transportation Coalition
7. November 13, 2003 - Maglev Meeting w/ Supervisor Mike Antonovich
8. November 19, 2003 - Golden State Gateway Coalition Board of Directors Meeting
9. January 15, 2004 - Destination 2030 Presentation in Santa Clarita

Orange County Council of Governments

1. February 12, 2003 - Orange County Regional Airport Authority, Al Perdon presents Maglev
2. February 18, 2003 - Draft Calif Transportation Plan 2025 Workshop, SCAG overview with RTP focus
3. February 20, 2003 - Draft Calif Transportation Plan 2025 Workshop, SCAG overview with RTP focus
4. February 25, 2003 - Draft Calif Transportation Plan 2025 Workshop, SCAG overview with RTP focus
5. February 27, 2003 - Orange Co COG, State of Region presentation by Ping Chang
6. April 22, 2003 - Federated Chambers of Commerce of Orange County
7. April 24, 2003 - Tustin Chamber of Commerce Annual Business Expo
8. May 05, 2003 - Presentation to OCTA Board & Committee
9. May 08, 2003 - Presentation to OCTA Transit Planning & Ops Cmte
10. May 12, 2003 - Presentation to OCTA Executive Board
11. May 13, 2003 - Orange County Business Council, Infrastructure Committee
12. May 14, 2003 - High Speed Ground Transportation Assn Conference
13. May 28, 2003 - Presentation to UCI Planning Class
14. June 02, 2003 - Presentation to UCI planning class
15. June 26, 2003 - Orange County Council of Governments
16. July 30, 2003 - Southern California Leadership Network Recruitment Reception
17. August 06, 2003 - SCAQMD Environmental Justice Training Workshop
18. August 19, 2003 - Focus Group on HOV Lane Effectiveness
19. August 20, 2003 - Focus Group on HOV Lanes
20. August 21, 2003 - Focus Group on HOV Lanes
21. September 21, 2003 - Unitarian Universalist Fellowship of Laguna Beach
22. September 25, 2003 - Destination 2030 Presentation to Orange County Council of Governments
23. October 07, 2003 - Meeting on RTP with OCTA Staff

24. October 07, 2003 - OCCOG TAC
25. October 14, 2003 - Orange County Business Council Infrastructure Committee
26. October 23, 2003 - Destination 2030 / Operation Jump-Start Presentation to OCCOG Board
27. November 04, 2003 - Orange County Council of Governments Technical Advisory Committee
28. November 13, 2003 - 7th Annual Regional Economic Forecast Conference
29. November 17, 2003 - Caltrans District 12 Executive Team Weekly Meeting
30. November 24, 2003 - Destination 2030 Presentation to Los Alamitos City Council
31. December 02, 2003 - Building Industry Association of Orange County, Transportation Committee
32. January 06, 2004 - Compass Technical Review Session at Brea
33. January 14, 2004 - Destination 2030 Public Meeting in Tustin
34. February 12, 2004 - Regional Transportation Plan--Orange Co Division, League of Cities
35. March 31, 2004 - Destination 2030 Presentation to Orange County Taxpayers Association

Regionwide

1. January 28, 2003 - Kick-off event for Compass "News Conference in the Sky"
2. February 07, 2003 - TV interview on "Local Talk" show, Jim Gosnell on State of Region
3. March 28, 2003 - 1st Compass Workshop
4. September 16, 2003 - Scoping Meeting for the PEIR for the 2004 RTP - Destination 2030
5. September 20, 2003 - Fall 2003 Summit with Tribal Governments
6. June 08, 2003 - Pacesetters TV Program -- KTLA, 6:00 a.m.
7. June 12, 2003 - SCAG on "Air Talk with Larry Mantle," KPCC
8. November 06, 2003 - League of Cities Los Angeles Co Division
9. November 21, 2003 - Destination 2030 Presentation to RTAC
10. January 09, 2004 - KPCC "Talk of the City" Broadcast on Funding and Transportation
11. January 15, 2004 - 2004 RTP / EIR Public Hearing in Los Angeles
12. February 20, 2004 - Winter 2004 Summit with Tribal Governments

San Bernardino Associated Governments

1. February 05, 2003 - Caltrans District 7 hosts CA Transportation Plan Reg Workshop
2. February 13, 2003 - Compass Citizen's Advisory Committee (CAC) meeting
3. February 19, 2003 - San Bernardino Associated Governments Committee, John Fregonese presents Compass
4. March 20, 2003 - Compass presentation to League of Cities Inland Empire Div.
5. April 07, 2003 - Compass presentation to Inland Empire Economic Partnership
6. April 25, 2003 - San Bernardino Valley CC, 2nd Annual Inland Empire Transportation Summit
7. May 08, 2003 - Compass Workshop - CSU San Bernardino
8. June 05, 2003 - North End Neighborhood Association, basic SCAG presentation
9. August 06, 2003 - SANBAG Board
10. October 07, 2003 - Victor Valley Meeting on Growth & RTP
11. October 21, 2003 - UCLA Symposium - Finance: The Critical Link
12. November 18, 2003 - Destination 2030 Presentation to San Bernardino officials
13. November 24, 2003 - Caltrans District 8 Executive Team Weekly Meeting
14. December 03, 2003 - Destination 2030 Presentation to SANBAG Board
15. December 15, 2003 - Compass Technical Review Session at SANBAG
16. December 18, 2003 - Destination 2030 Presentation by San Bernardino Co RC Members
17. January 05, 2004 - Meeting with SANBAG on So Cal Logistics Airport
18. January 08, 2004 - Destination 2030 Public Meeting in Victorville
19. January 10, 2004 - Destination 2030 Public Meeting in Rialto
20. January 20, 2004 - Destination 2030 Presentation to Inland Action Group

San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments

1. September 23, 2003 - Alhambra Rotary Club
2. October 07, 2003 - Meeting on 2004 RTP with San Gabriel Valley Economic Alliance
3. November 04, 2003 - Staff Meeting with South Coast AQMD
4. November 13, 2003 - Institute of Transportation Engineers
5. November 13, 2003 - San Gabriel Valley COG Transportation Committee

6. November 13, 2003 - Destination 2030 Presentation to San Gabriel Valley Economic Partnership
7. November 20, 2003 - Destination 2030 Discussion at San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments
8. December 05, 2003 - South Coast Air Quality Management District Ad-Hoc Board Committee to Review and Consider SCAG's 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
9. December 16, 2003 - Maglev Presentation to the West Covina City Council
10. January 08, 2004 - Destination 2030 Presentation to Residents for a Better Alhambra
11. January 12, 2004 - Destination 2030 Presentation to Pasadena City Council
12. January 26, 2004 - RTP / TAC Presentation at San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments
13. February 02, 2004 - RTP Presentation to San Marino Traffic Commission

South Bay Cities Council of Governments

1. August 05, 2003 - RTP Presentation
2. September 25, 2003 - Destination 2030 & Operation Jump Start Presentation to South Bay Cities COG
3. November 19, 2003 - Operation Jump Start Presentation to South Bay COG City Managers
4. January 14, 2004 - Compass Technical Review Session at Torrance --South Bay Cities
5. March 18, 2004 - RTP Presentation to Manhattan Beach Coordinating Council

Ventura Council of Governments

1. April 17, 2003 - Thousand Oaks Rotary Club
2. May 13, 2003 - VCTC Citizen Advisory Committee
3. May 15, 2003 - Compass Presentation
4. August 28, 2003 - RTP Presentation to VCOG
5. September 23, 2003 - Compass Presentation to Editorial Board of Ventura County Star
6. October 03, 2003 - Destination 2030 Presentation to VCTC
7. October 15, 2003 - Destination 2030 Presentation to Port Hueneme City Council
8. November 25, 2003 - Destination 2030 Presentation to Oxnard City Council
9. November 26, 2003 - Meeting with VCTC Staff
10. January 08, 2004 - Compass Technical Review Session at Ventura County
11. February 02, 2004 - Destination 2030 Presentation to Santa Paula City Council
12. February 09, 2004 - Destination 2030 Public Meeting in Ventura County
13. March 18, 2004 - RTP & Operation Jump Start Presentation to Economic Development Collaborative

Western Riverside Council of Governments

1. January 27, 2003 - Riverside City Council, presentation on State of Region by Hon. Ron Loveridge
2. February 20, 2003 - Riverside County City Managers
3. March 03, 2003 - Western Riverside COG Executive Committee, State of Region presentation
4. April 07, 2003 - Compass presentation by consultant to Western Riverside COG
5. April 10, 2003 - Greater Riverside Chamber of Commerce Good Morning meeting, Announcement of Compass Workshop on May 8th
6. May 08, 2003 - Compass Workshop - Hemet
7. June 04, 2003 - Discussion of PILUT Scenario 2
8. July 08, 2003 - Banning City Council Meeting
9. July 15, 2003 - Ontario Chamber of Commerce Luncheon
10. July 22, 2003 - South Coast AQMD EJ Training Workshop
11. August 15, 2003 - Hemet San Jacinto Action Group
12. August 15, 2003 - Valley Group (Hemet/San Jacinto)
13. September 03, 2003 - Jump-Start Presentation to RCTC
14. October 06, 2003 - Destination 2030 Presentation to WRCOG Executive Committee
15. October 14, 2003 - Infrastructure Roundtable
16. October 24, 2003 - Operation Jump Start Presentation
17. November 12, 2003 - Destination 2030 Presentation to RCTC
18. November 12, 2003 - Destination 2030 Presentation to WRCOG Planning Directors
19. January 07, 2004 - Compass Technical Review Session at Western Riverside

20. January 07, 2004 - Destination 2030 Presentation to Center for Community Action and Environmental Justice
21. January 14, 2004 - Destination 2030 Presentation to Hemet San Jacinto Valley Chamber of Commerce
22. January 16, 2004 - WRCOG SANDAG I-15 Interregional Partnership Meeting
23. January 20, 2004 - Destination 2030 Presentation to Riverside City Council
24. January 21, 2004 - SCAG Overview Presentation to Norco City Council
25. January 27, 2004 - Destination 2030 Workshop at Riverside
26. February 02, 2004 - Destination 2030 Public Meeting in Hemet
27. February 20, 2004 - Greater Riverside Chamber of Commerce Transportation Committee
28. February 26, 2004 - Destination 2030 at Hemet / San Jacinto
29. March 19, 2004 - Riverside Greater Chamber of Commerce Transportation Committee

Westside Cities

1. May 22, 2003 - Santa Monica College
2. September 25, 2003 - Westside Cities TAC Meeting
3. November 06, 2003 - Santa Monica College Fall Speakers Series - "Smart Cities Are Sustainable Cities"
4. December 17, 2003 - Compass Technical Review Session at Beverly Hills --Westside Cities

Index to Public Comments and Response for the 2004 Regional Transportation Plan (2004 RTP)

CITIES & COUNTIES

City/County	Commentor	Record ID
City Of Anaheim	Johnson, Linda	RTP-04-178
City Of Barstow	Priester, Scott	RTP-04-029
City Of Blythe	Crain, Robert	RTP-04-098
City Of Brawley	Arellano, Yazmin	RTP-04-120
City Of Brea	Beauman, John	RTP-04-102
City Of Burbank	Alvord, Mary J.	RTP-04-114
City Of Chino	Arnold, Brent	RTP-04-174
City Of Chino Hills	Collier, Jeffrey W.	RTP-04-036
City Of Coachella	Petritz, David	RTP-04-165
City Of Corona	Licata, John N.	RTP-04-169
City Of Diamond Bar	Lowry, Linda C.	RTP-04-034
City of Glendale/Arroyo Verdugo	Aguilar, Elaine I.	RTP-04-001
City of Glendale/Arroyo Verdugo	Aguilar, Elaine I.	RTP-04-002
City of Irvine	Richard J. Sandzimier	RTP-04-011
City Of La Canada Flintridge	Del Guercio, Stephen A.	RTP-04-025
City of Lake Forest	Cooper, Brent	RTP-04-141
City Of Lancaster	Gilley, James C.	RTP-04-051
City Of Long Beach	Lowenthal, Bonnie	RTP-04-149
City Of Los Angeles	Fortman, Richard	RTP-04-065
City Of Los Angeles	Reyes, Ed	RTP-04-155
City Of Los Angeles	Hardison, Gretchen H.	RTP-04-158
City of Los Angeles DOT	Tanda, Wayne K.	RTP-04-147
City Of Montebello	Pace, Tonya	RTP-04-170
City Of Montebello	Pace, Tonya	RTP-04-171
City Of Moreno Valley	West, Frank	RTP-04-118
City Of Norwalk	Mendez, Michael A.	RTP-04-107
City Of Ontario	Blum, Jerry	RTP-04-103
City Of Palm Desert	Ortega, Carlos L.	RTP-04-063
City of Pasadena, Department of Transportation	Amerson, Joyce Y.	RTP-04-081
City Of Rancho Palos Verdes	Rojas, Joel	RTP-04-150
City Of San Jacinto	Ayres, Jim	RTP-04-077
City Of Santa Clarita	Bertoni, Vince	RTP-04-101
City Of Santa Paula	Bartlett, Thomas M.	RTP-04-005
City Of Santa Paula	Bartlett, Thomas M.	RTP-04-113
City Of Seal Beach	Campbell, Patricia E.	RTP-04-088
City Of Sierra Madre	Doyle, Bart	RTP-04-166
City Of Simi Valley	Sedell, Mike	RTP-04-119
City Of South Pasadena	Cacciotti, Michael A.	RTP-04-096
County Of Imperial	Heuberger AICP, CEP, Jurg	RTP-04-007
County Of Los Angeles	Noyes, James A.	RTP-04-164
County Of Orange	Smith, Charles V.	RTP-04-168
County Of Orange	Smith, Charles V.	RTP-04-185

CTC's & SUBREGIONS

CTC/Subregions	Commentor	Record ID
City of Glendale/Arroyo Verdugo	Yousefian, Bob	RTP-04-161
CVAG	CVAG	RTP-04-151
Gateway Cities COG	Powers, Richard R.	RTP-04-082
Gateway Cities COG	Powers, Richard R.	RTP-04-124
Imperial County / IVAG	Ham, Robert	RTP-04-073
LACMTA	De La Loza, James L.	RTP-04-121
Las Virgenes/Malibu COG	Terry Dipple	RTP-04-153
Orange County Transportation Authority	Leahy, Arthur T.	RTP-04-108
Riverside County Transportation Commission	Sugita, Hideo D.	RTP-04-127
SANBAG	Alexander, Bill	RTP-04-110
South Bay Cities Council of Governments	Bacharach, Jacki	RTP-04-140
Ventura County Transp. Commission	Gherardi, Ginger	RTP-04-042
Westside Cities: Beverly Hills	Dahlerbruch, Anton	RTP-04-100
WRCOG	Venable, James A.	RTP-04-129

PUBLIC AGENCIES

Public Agency	Commentor	Record ID
Big Blue Bus	Negriff, Stephanie	RTP-04-104
Burbank-Glendale Pasadena Airport	Marrero, Dios	RTP-04-023
Caltrans District 7, 8 11, 12	Casey, Rose	RTP-04-146
City of Ontario Fire Department	Bowman, Jim W.	RTP-04-059
City of Riverside Police Department	Leach, Russ	RTP-04-012
City of Upland Police Department	Thouvenell, Martin E.	RTP-04-030
Federal Transit Administration FHWA	Balmir, Sandra	RTP-04-176
Foothill Transit	Kumar, Rohul	RTP-04-018
John Wayne Airport	Alan Murphy	RTP-04-130
John Wayne Airport	Murphy, Alan	RTP-04-131
LADOT	Carranza, PE, Tomas	RTP-04-125
Littlerock Town Council	Tetu, Dennis	RTP-04-099
Long Beach Transit	Heston, Guy B.	RTP-04-039
Los Angeles World Airports	Ritchie, Jim	RTP-04-173
LOSSAN Rail Corridor Agency	Brown, Art	RTP-04-115
March Joint Powers Authority	Rizzo, Phil	RTP-04-027
Orangeline Development Authority	De La Torre, Hector	RTP-04-064
Port of Long Beach	Kanter, Ph.D., Robert	RTP-04-126
Port of Los Angeles	Keller, Larry	RTP-04-105
Rialto Police Department	Michael A. Meyers,	RTP-04-008
Riverside County Transp. and Land Mgmt Agency	Thakkar, Mitra	RTP-04-181
Riverside Transit Agency	Rubio, Larry	RTP-04-093
Riverside Transit Agency	Rubio, Larry	RTP-04-097
SCRRA	Solow, David	RTP-04-122
South Coast Air Quality Mgmt Dist	Wallerstein, Barry R.	RTP-04-145
State Senator's Office	Karnette, Betty	RTP-04-112
Transportation Corridor Agencies	Cleary-Milan, Macie	RTP-04-026

PUBLIC INTEREST GROUPS

Organization	Commentor	Record ID
Agua Caliente Band of Indians	Davis, Thomas J.	RTP-04-172
AirFair	Seely, Melinda	RTP-04-072
Atkins Environmental H.E.L.P., INC.	Atkins, B.J.	RTP-04-076
Automobile Club of Southern California	Finnegan, Stephen	RTP-04-128
BIA of Southern California	Priest, Todd	RTP-04-163
California Association of Highway Patrolmen	Hamm, Jon H.	RTP-04-019
California State Firefighters' Association, Inc.	Vargas, Afrack	RTP-04-022
Californians for Safe Highways	Name, No	RTP-04-116
Coalition for a Safe Environment	Marquez, Jesse N.	RTP-04-060
Congress of California Seniors	Lacayo, Henry L.	RTP-04-014
Emgncy Med. Srvc's Admstrators Assoc. of Calif.	LaPolla, Nancy	RTP-04-040
Friends 4 Expo Transit	Clarke, Darrell	RTP-04-177
Homeowners Of Encino	Silver, Gerald	RTP-04-068
I DO Parties Wedding & Event Consultant	Pilarski, Stella	RTP-04-111
Inland Empire Economic Partnership	Ooms, Teri	RTP-04-041
Law Offices of David L. Hoffman	Hoffman, David L.	RTP-04-074
Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition	Lund, Kastle	RTP-04-160
LSA Associates	Wilhelm, Ken	RTP-04-148
North County Transportation Coalition	Ledford, James C.	RTP-04-038
Orange County SAFE KIDS Coalition	Feczko, Michelle	RTP-04-021
P & H Enterprises	Lounsbury, Peter B.	RTP-04-057
Peace Officers Research Association of Calif.	Ervin, Sr., Michael J.	RTP-04-015
Peace Officers Research Association of Calif.	Ervin, Sr., Michael J.	RTP-04-062
Physicians for Social Responsibility-Los Angeles	Parfrey, Arguello, & Estrada	RTP-04-152
Poole & Shaffery, LLP	Shaffery, John	RTP-04-075
Rail Advocates of Orange County	Shahbazian, Roy	RTP-04-066
Robert Bunyan & Associates	Bunyan, Robert	RTP-04-162
Santa Clarita Chamber of Commerce	Harte, Duane	RTP-04-050
SCV TMA	Worden-Roberts, Connie	RTP-04-109
Southern California Council on Envi	Stewart, Jim	RTP-04-055
The Irvine Company	Letterly, Steve	RTP-04-154
UltraViolet Devices, Inc.	Goetz, Daniel M.	RTP-04-095
Urban Dimensions	Denny Zane	RTP-04-061
USC Keck School of Medicine	Peters, John M.	RTP-04-182
Valencia Industrial Association	Norris, Kathy	RTP-04-079
Ventura County APCD	Cacatian, Ben	RTP-04-179
Woman's Club of Artesia-Cerritos	Low, Mabel	RTP-04-053
Woman's Club of Artesia-Cerritos	Barlow, Norene	RTP-04-058

CONCERNED CITIZENS

Name		Record ID
Armstrong, Bob and Sue Jean		RTP-04-067
Armstrong, Robert		RTP-04-048
Armstrong, Sue		RTP-04-049
Arvizo, Daniel		RTP-04-043
Aspray, Patricia		RTP-04-046
Blagof, Ray		RTP-04-010
Blumenfeld, Jane		RTP-04-157

Name		Record ID
Burke, Catherine		RTP-04-054
Butcher, Everett		RTP-04-143
Campbell, Todd		RTP-04-167
Carpio, Cecil		RTP-04-180
Chang, Robert		RTP-04-139
Conger, Shirley		RTP-04-070
DE La Torre, Birgit		RTP-04-156
Depew, James		RTP-04-024
Ema, Chris		RTP-04-069
Flam, Rick		RTP-04-003
Fox, Eleanor A.		RTP-04-087
Gabelich, Rae		RTP-04-184
Galaw, Mary R.		RTP-04-085
Gordon, Rita		RTP-04-090
Griffin, Charles		RTP-04-136
Guensler, Tammy		RTP-04-028
Hatala, (The Hatala Family)		RTP-04-132
Hippard, Colleen		RTP-04-159
Hossan, Carole		RTP-04-144
Hunter, C		RTP-04-035
Kater, Pat		RTP-04-045
Kidokoro, Yuki		RTP-04-006
Lim, Joseph		RTP-04-106
Lumis, Unknown		RTP-04-047
Maldonado, Joan		RTP-04-123
McKeon, Howard P. "Buck"		RTP-04-094
Messina, Barbara		RTP-04-032
Mikels, Judy		RTP-04-009
Moorehead, Debbie		RTP-04-117
Murphy, Marie		RTP-04-086
Nyre, Donald		RTP-04-052
Nyre, Donald		RTP-04-142
Orona, Ruben		RTP-04-134
Pennell, Margary		RTP-04-089
Platt, Kimberly		RTP-04-083
Reina, Jose		RTP-04-044
Ricks, Rex		RTP-04-183
Robinson, Joel		RTP-04-017
Romero, Charles D.		RTP-04-037
Ross, Jay		RTP-04-078
Sewell, Ruth		RTP-04-091
Sewell, Ruth A.		RTP-04-071
Sharp, Lee		RTP-04-084
Shates, Tim		RTP-04-137
Sherwood, June		RTP-04-092
Silver, Gerald A.		RTP-04-013
Steckler, Beth		RTP-04-175
Stevens, Michael		RTP-04-033
Striegl, Anton		RTP-04-138

Name		Record ID
Suwol, Robina		RTP-04-004
Teplitz, Richard		RTP-04-133
Townsend, Susan E.		RTP-04-080
Wagner, Jack		RTP-04-031
Walsh, Carol Lee		RTP-04-056
Walsh, Debbie		RTP-04-020
Watt, Ann		RTP-04-135
Webb, Ralph H.		RTP-04-016

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
 (Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-001	10/29/2003	Aguilar, Elaine I.	City of Glendale/Arroyo Verdugo	Does the local portion of transportation funding shown in the draft 2004 RTP include funding that goes directly to cities? Would this money go to the counties or SCAG as a result of the RTP?	About 50% (across the board) of local funds were included in the estimate of total transportation revenues in this RTP. This was an effort to reflect the contribution of local governments to the regional transportation system. The funds would not flow any differently as a result of the RTP.
RTP-04-002	10/29/2003	Aguilar, Elaine I.	City of Glendale/Arroyo Verdugo	Has any federal money been appropriated yet for Maglev?	SCAG has received Federal money for project planning including feasibility studies and preliminary engineering for the Southern California Maglev system under TEA-21 Federal legislation.
RTP-04-003	10/29/2003	Flam, Rick		I have been informed that SCAG intends to hold a number of meeting dealing with possible expansion of the 101 Freeway. As a resident living near the 101 Freeway I would like to request that SAG hold several meetings, after work hours, in the West San Fernando Valley where this subject can be vetted ⁸⁵ .	The 2004 Regional Transportation Plan seeks to ensure that the six county SCAG region will continue to be successfully served by its transportation system in 2030. The Plan contains projects that SCAG and the County Transportation Commissions believe are needed for this purpose. SCAG looks to local planning processes to identify the short- and medium-term steps needed to facilitate our long-term vision. The draft Plan contains the following references to the 101 freeway: * Page 88, Table 4.7, Toll Corridor Projects: "US-101 Corridor (SR-23 to SR-134/SR-170) User-Fee-Backed Capacity Enhancement; Implementation Schedule: 2030" * Page 160, Table 7.1, Post-2030 Long-Range Corridors: "State Route 101; Source: LACMTA". You may view the draft Plan at our website (http://www.scag.ca.gov/).
RTP-04-004	11/6/2003	Suwol, Robina		Van Nuys on Chandler & Oxnard are in process of becoming dedicated busways, and future rapid bus routes. The transit stop is part of the bus route, and will certainly impact the neighborhood. However, another major source of pollution will be the Chandler-Oxnard Route which is about 50 yards from where I live in Van Nuys. If you could provide some information it would be greatly appreciated. We are also impacted by Chrome Plating, Cement Mixing, Auto body, Stucco, Refinishing, Chevron Refueling and other industry. Adding the bus route is yet another environmental issue we will be facing.	First, this bus rapid transit line will be listed in the Technical Appendix to the Regional Transportation Plan in the List of Projects. It is a "baseline" project, meaning that it is already funded (and in fact, is already being implemented). The Technical Appendices to the RTP should be posted mid-next week on our web site if you would like to look it up. Second, our plan analysis process is conducted at the regional level and does not focus on local project impacts. For both these reasons, it would be necessary to approach LA County MTA about your concerns on this particular project.

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-005	11/7/2003	Bartlett, Thomas M.	City Of Santa Paula	<p>1. Exhibit 2.3 fails to accurately depict future growth for the City of Santa Paula in Ventura County because map only shows one lone dot in the area of Santa Paula when there should be at least 10 dots (each dot equals 1000 persons in this dot density map).</p> <p>2. Exhibit 4.4 fails to show the City of Santa Paula as a future activity center. Our General Plan clearly forecasts and anticipates long-term growth to about 5,000 to 7,000 persons per square mile and between 2,000 and 3,000 employees per sq. mile. Please make the appropriate changes to these two exhibits.</p>	<p>1. SCAG analyzed the suggested revision. An adjustment has been made to the socio economic forecast for the Ventura County sub-region in response to this and other comments.</p> <p>2. Exhibit 4.4 depicts activity centers based upon employment and population density levels at the traffic analysis zone (TAZ) level. The TAZs that comprise the Santa Paula city limits do not meet the criteria identified in the legend of Exhibit 4.4.</p>
RTP-04-006	11/10/2003	Kidokoro, Yuki		How much of a budget there is planned for expansions/improvements specific to freeways. Please let me know the amount or where I might find this information.	The Draft 2004 RTP addresses a total of \$151 billion in public dollar commitments through the plan horizon of 2030. The dollar amounts are expressed in constant 2002 dollars. Total existing commitments: \$115 billion (37% Roadway and 63% Transit) . Existing commitments include costs of operating and maintaining our roadways and transit system and implementing capital projects that are already committed. Additional Commitment: \$36 billion (64% Roadway, 29% Transit and 7% TDM, ITS, Bikeways etc.). Therefore, total commitments for roadway operation, maintenance and improvements is approximately \$65 billion. Approximately \$40 billion of this goes to Highways (primarily freeways) and \$25 billion to Arterials.
RTP-04-007	11/17/2003	Heuberg r AICP,CE P, Jurg	County Of Imperial	<p>1. The re-opening of the inter-county railroad line from San Diego County to Imperial County should be noted in the 2004 Final RTP for possible future funding and also for regional information. This railroad line may assist in increasing NAFTA imports and exports to and from Mexicali, Mexico to the San Diego region.</p> <p>2. What methodology has been used for determining any and all growth (population, household and employment) forecasts?</p> <p>3. The Imperial County Airport has recently been designated as an "International Airport and recently there has been informal mtgs and a discussion of a Regional Cargo Airport being sited in Imperial County by San Diego proponents along with a discussion of a high speed rail system. The Final RTP should mention in Chapter 7 that the San Diego to Imperial County railroad reopening is pending along with the</p>	<p>1. Comment duly noted. Appropriate language will be considered for incorporation in the final RTP.</p> <p>2. SCAG region growth forecasts of employment, population, and household are derived from two models: (1) Population Cohort survival model to project population (household projection are determined through headship rates), (2) Shift-share model to project employment growth. For detail process and methodology, please see the 2004 RTP Technical Appendix A Growth Forecast.</p> <p>3. Comment noted.</p> <p>4. The SR-78 Brawley Bypass Corridor is already listed as a Baseline project in Technical Appendix I, page I-2.</p> <p>5. The 2004 RTP PEIR (page 3.4-22) discusses the special problems facing Imperial County due to the transport of air pollutants into the Salton Sea Air Basin, both from the South Coast Air Basin and from portions of Mexico, south of the US-Mexico border. However, the Imperial County Air Pollution Control District faces real challenges in</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>siting of a Regional Airport and possible High Speed Rail service from San Diego to Phoenix.</p> <p>4. Table 7.1 identifies a "...Westmorland Bypass Corridor, IVAG" and this should be corrected to read "Brawley Bypass Corridor."</p> <p>5. The Final RTP should address the continuing and cumulative impact that SCAG's fugitive and mobile air emissions have on the residents of Imperial County and that any and all mitigation measures to improve the air quality in the SCAQMD will also improve the Salton Sea Air Basin's air quality as well.</p> <p>6. Southwest Passage: This section needs to completely address the shipping routes from Mexico through Imperial County, including the western route to San Diego, the eastern route to Yuma, and the northern routes to LA, Riverside, and San Bernardino. Special attention should be placed on the County's three existing ports of entry and the impact of NAFTA on inter-county commerce.</p> <p>7. Maps supplied are not nearly detailed enough to determine the locations of routes, and locations of highways, airports, rail and other transit lines.</p>	<p>devising strategies to control emissions, particularly in the case of particulate matter, resulting from sources under its control. One effort to resolve the question about the relative share of transported emissions to generated emissions is currently being reviewed in a court case before the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals.</p> <p>6. Comment noted. A brief discussion of Point of Entry (POE) goods movement traffic will be considered for incorporation in the final RTP.</p> <p>7. The maps provided in the RTP correctly display the locations and routes of highways, airports, rail, and other transit lines. Unfortunately, given the size and complexity of the six-county region and the limitations of the page size, it is not possible to show these features at a detailed scale while simultaneously depicting the region as a whole.</p>
RTP-04-008	11/24/2003	Meyers, Michael A.	Rialto Police Department	Urges SCAG to add language into the RTP that states the truck only lanes will NOT allow longer combination vehicles (LCVs).	Comment noted.
RTP-04-009	11/26/2003	Mikels, Judy		1. Request RTP and attendant Regional Plan Growth Forecast be changed to reflect the State's recent purchase of Ahmanson Ranch which removes that property from the County of Ventura's residential land inventory. This action has the effect of reducing the County's land inventory for residential development as reflected in the General Plan Land Use Appendix which is part of the County's certified housing element.	An adjustment to the forecasted growth for the Ventura County sub-region has been made in response to this comment.

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-010	11/28/2003	Blagof, Ray		<p>Look for other solutions other than widening the 101 Freeway.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To further relieve congestion, it would seem possible that the fwy could become a toll road 2. There should be "some sort of mandatory situation whereby people must have at least 2 persons per vehicle or have some program that would stringently make a program of carpooling necessary. 3. Make a survey of individuals who use the freeway for daily business purposes. 4. Reduce speed limit to 50 mph or less at peak traffic times with strict enforcement. 5. Use the center lane of the fwy for a light rail system and also a system for using the highways alongside the fwy for peak traffic travel. 6. What happened to the rail line that ran along side Chandler Blvd? Why couldn't this be reconsidered as a means of easing transportation? 7. I strongly feel that the widening of the fwy would make life very hectic for anyone near such a project. 	<p>The 101 Corridor between the SR 134/170 interchange and SR 23 at the Ventura County Line has been identified in the Draft 2004 for the addition of the equivalence of two additional lanes of capacity to be completed by 2030. The Draft 2004 RTP also calls for significant TSM and TDM improvement in the corridor. This is based upon the longstanding deficiencies in capacity the 101 corridor, resulting in significant congestion, and increasing demand forecast in the Draft 2004 RTP. SCAG is working with affected agencies and the community to identify options, which seek to minimize impacts on adjacent communities. The draft 2004 RTP identifies innovative public/private funding options for the constrained funding scenario to pay for construction of the additional capacity on this segment of the 101 corridor. Additional needs for improved east west capacity in the San Fernando Valley and improved connectivity at major interchanges has been noted and will be the subject of future study.</p> <p>SCAG's Transportation and Communications Committee at its February 5th, 2004 meeting recommended consideration of the following alternatives for the 2004 RTP in the US-101 Corridor (101/110 Interchange to SR 23/101 Interchange/Ventura County Line): (a) Potential capacity enhancements within the existing right of way or requiring minimum right of way acquisition on the segment from the 101/134/170 Interchange to the 23/101 Interchange at the Ventura County line. This will be based upon the results of further consultant analysis to be completed in February 2004;(b)Extensive Transportation System Management (TSM) and transit options, as appropriate, identified in the corridor study, as well as, priority near and mid-term TSM and transit options, as appropriate, identified in the City of Los Angeles Community Advisory process for all portions of the 101 Corridor, and (c) Continued study of long term east-west travel needs in the 101/San Fernando Valley Corridor and further study of improvements to system connectivity and potential operational improvements to key Freeway/Freeway interchanges.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-011	12/1/2003	Richard J. Sandzimer	City of Irvine	<p>1. Insure consistency between OCTA long range plan and SCAG Plan - consider including language confirming and/or clarifying this consistency.</p> <p>2. Requests that growth scenarios be consistent with the City's adopted General Plan and Master Plan of Arterial Highways, particularly growth scenarios should include the recent LAFCO approved annexation by the City of Irvine of the former MCAS El Toro Base and surrounding areas. Consistent with the Great Park Plan and the voter approved Measure W development of the 4,738-acre El Toro property...(see letter)</p> <p>3. City supportive of multi-modal transportation approach</p> <p>4. Believe grade separation projects must be a priority.</p> <p>5. Please include recommendations for grade crossing corridor projects through central Orange County.</p> <p>6. RTP consider and ensure funding opportunities to support upgrading the Irvine Transportation Center to accommodate passenger demand that will be influenced by both intra-city and inter-city rail systems.</p> <p>7. RTP needs to consider buildout of the Irvine Transportation Center in accordance with Master Plan</p> <p>8. RTP must provide adequate park-in-ride facilities at all proposed station locations</p> <p>9. Encourages expanded discussion on land use and transit coordination and transit oriented development strategies given the planned OCTA Center Line light rail transit system currently underway.</p>	<p>1. Comment duly noted. SCAG has made every effort to ensure consistency between OCTA's long range plan and the 2004 RTP.</p> <p>2. An adjustment to the forecasted growth for the Orange County sub-region has been made in response to this comment.</p> <p>3. Comment noted. SCAG appreciates the support.</p> <p>4. Comment noted. SCAG concurs and accordingly significant public funding is proposed to implement the grade separation projects.</p> <p>5. Comment noted. A number of critical grade crossing improvements, including the ones at Sand Canyon and Jeffrey Road are included in the plan as part of the baseline (no-project).</p> <p>6. Comment duly noted.</p> <p>7. Comment duly noted.</p> <p>8. Comment duly noted.</p> <p>9. The 2004 RTP strongly supports the coordination of land use and transportation. The Plan calls for increased an better coordination between transit and land use. It emphasizes the need for the region to develop and adopt a long-term strategy that would integrate the development process with the transportation system. It also calls for promotion of transit oriented developments along the major transit corridors (bus and rail).</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-012	12/4/2003	Leach, Russ	City of Riverside Police Department	City of Riverside Police Dept.. opposes the use of LCVs on proposed dedicated truck lanes or on any roads in So.Calif. due to safety concerns.	Comment noted.
RTP-04-013	12/4/2003	Silver, Gerald A. Silver		<p>HOMEOWNERS OF ENCINO PO BOX 260205 ENCINO, CA 91426 gsilver@sprintmail.com December 2, 2003 Nancy Pfeffer, Senior Regional Planner Southern Calif. Assn. of Governments (SCAG) 818 W. 7th St. Los Angeles, CA 90017 Fax: (213)236-1963 Pfeffer@scag.ca.gov RE: DRAFT 2004 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP)</p> <p>We have had an opportunity to review a draft of the 2004 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), but were NOT provided with a copy of the Appendix. We understand that the Appendix contains specific details on projects proposed to be included in the RTP.</p> <p>Please enter our comments into the formal record, regarding the Draft 2004 RTP. We reserve the right to make additional comments upon receipt of the Appendix.</p> <p>GENERAL COMMENTS:</p> <p>1. A major flaw throughout the RTP is the blind acceptance of growth in this region, as though it is inevitable. SCAG appears bent on providing transportation infrastructure without consideration for the finite limits of resources in the region. An astute planner once said, if you don't want a city with 10 million people, then don't provide the infrastructure for 10 million people!</p> <p>2. SCAG has done an poor job of consulting the public most affected by the RTP proposals. This RTP will be worthless, and merely a fruitless planning exercise, unless there is broad public acceptance of the proposals. This must include acceptance by local</p>	<p>1. The growth assumptions within the 2004 RTP are consistent with or similar to forecasting approaches used in other regions around the country. The forecast has been subjected to rigorous review, including input from leading demographers and economists. SCAG utilized a Forecasting Technical Task Force which assisted in refining forecast assumptions. Growth in the region is not inevitable, but is likely to occur given demographic and economic conditions in the region beyond the control of any government entity. Further, SCAG believes the growth forecasted in the 2004 RTP is on the conservative end of the most likely range of outcomes.</p> <p>2. The 2004 RTP was developed with the support of an extensive public outreach program that directly reached approximately 5,000 residents of the SCAG region, plus many more who saw the over 200 press articles about the Plan. The outreach program involved more than 200 events, including custom presentations, public workshops and meetings, and several media broadcasts—more events than were conducted for the 2001 RTP despite a reduced budget. As a result of this extensive public outreach, we had more attendees at our public hearing and received more public comment letters for the 2004 RTP than during development of the 2001 RTP.</p> <p>3. In the congested areas such as the SCAG region, traffic on the roadways with lower speed (much lower than designed capacity/speed) generates more emissions. Therefore, region-wide and on the roadway systems bringing the traffic speed closer to normal (designed capacity/speed) are the by-product of the TCM projects (i.e. transit and HOV lanes) and improvements on the standard roadway systems.</p> <p>4. The comment is noted. COMPASS sessions prior to the release of the Draft RTP were attended by more than 1,000 individuals from all areas of the region. The sessions were open to any interested attendees. The majority of feedback from the sessions indicates that participants were able to express their views on the future of the region.</p> <p>5. Refer also the response to comment number 1. The forecast used in the 2004 RTP is consistent with broad-based, accepted planning methodology. SCAG is not aware of accepted planning methodology leading to an estimation of finite carrying capacity for a region.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>residents who will be severely and negatively impacted. Your efforts at “public outreach” as described, is a far cry from the reality of what SCAG is actually doing. Few people know about the RTP, nor will participate in its development. (p.29)</p> <p>3. It is ludicrous to believe that air quality will improve by expanding freeway capacity! The Draft 2004 RTP shows a rank ignorance of the most basic traffic concept—“latent demand.” Adding more miles to the present freeway system will only bring more cars, trucks and congestion, and degrade the transportation system.</p> <p>4. There is frequent reference to the “comprehensive and coordinated” planning process used by SCAG, called COMPASS. We have attended COMPASS sessions, and believe that they are a sham, and provide bogus planning results because they fail to reflect many community wishes and concerns. (p. 20, p. 21) Page 2</p> <p>5. Your theoretical population projection of 22.9 million residents by the year 2030 is flawed. You project a population increase of 38%, or 6.3 million residents between 2000 and 2030. Your planning process fails to grasp the fundamental objections that residents have to unbridled growth and the blind expansion of transportation resources. Nowhere in the planning process is there any consideration given to the “finite carrying capacity” of the region. Quality of life issues must over-ride massive freeway expansion, such as double-decking or widening the Ventura freeway.</p> <p>ELEMENTS OF THE RTP THAT WE FIND ACCEPTABLE:</p> <p>1. A limited number of auxiliary lanes that assist in merging would be acceptable, if placed at strategic locations. (p. 82) We support freeway modifications that improve safety or reduce congestion. We DO NOT support expanding freeway capacity. (p. 5)</p> <p>2. Some additional mixed flow lanes may be need in the freeway system, but we do not support high</p>	<p>Your comments relative to ‘ELEMENTS OF THE RTP THAT WE FIND ACCEPTABLE’ as well as ‘ELEMENTS OF THE RTP THAT WE OPPOSE’ are duly noted.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
 (Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes, nor high occupancy toll (HOT) lanes. There is a general public objection to these types of lanes. (p. 6 and p. 88)</p> <p>3. We support added a strategic number of truck climbing lanes, where needed. (p. 6)</p> <p>4. We support bus rapid transit (BRT) and bus system expansion because buses operate at a much lower cost than rail and require much less capital investment. (p. 6 and p.89)</p> <p>5. We support improving ground access to the Palmdale Airport. This will relieve the load on LAX, and should be a high priority item in the RTP. (p. 9)</p> <p>6. We agree with the need to integrate growth, planning and transportation. Land use must be given full consideration in revising transportation planning. To date SCAG has done an abysmal job of coordinating jobs, housing and land use. (p. 20) In Los Angeles city, zoning exceptions are routinely given to developers with virtually no consideration to their impacts on transportation and mobility.</p> <p>7. We agree that the “assumption of increased urbanization and intensification, [are] bound to be the most controversial aspect of land-use measures...”. SCAG should follow the wishes of the public, and not be in the business of social engineering! (p. 22)</p> <p>8. We agree that LAWA must continue to develop a Master Plan for Palmdale Airport and see that it is implemented promptly. (p.23)</p> <p>9. We agree that SCAG plans “must be developed through an open and inclusive process that ensures public input ...” This is a major failing in the current RTP process! (p.25) SCAG’s failure to meet with San Fernando homeowner community leaders is particularly distressing.</p> <p>10. We agree with your stated goal to “protect and enhance the environment, promote energy conservation and improve quality of life.” This must be ranked higher on your list of planning goals, and must be given more than simply lip service. (p.26 and p. 65)</p> <p>11. We agree with your “flow-improving” recommendations, including faster freeway service patrol, better traveler information systems, and the like. (p.72)</p>	

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
 (Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>12. We agree with your “work-at-home” recommendations. (p.77)</p> <p>13. We agree with your recommendations that involve improvements in the arterial system. A better-designed and functioning arterial street system will reduce demand on the region's freeway system. (p.81)</p> <p>14. We support your recommendations regarding sound wall retrofitting. (p.89)</p> <p>Page 3 ELEMENTS OF THE RTP THAT WE OPPOSE, OR BELIEVE ARE FLAWED:</p> <p>1. We oppose expansion of the Metrolink system because of its high operating and capital costs. Rail has proven to be a huge drain on transportation resources and draws too much money away from the bus system. (p. 7)</p> <p>2. We oppose the RTP proposal too expand the use of Transit-Oriented Development (TOD). There is little or no scientific evidence that supports the notion that population density increases in a corridor encourage public transportation usage. According to the research studies we have seen, there is no truth to the claim that high-density, residential commercial developments will encourage people to use their cars less! Hopefully SCAG will study the facts before blindly accepting this self-serving, “pro-development” myth. (p. 7) SCAG must tread lightly on the notion of “in-fill development.” Studies do not support your conclusion that it increases transit ridership. (p. 8 and p. 79) We oppose granting “mixed-use” density bonuses to encourage land-use intensity. (p.91)</p> <p>3. We do not support the use of unproven or highly experimental transportation systems, such as Magnetic Levitation (MagLev). SCAG should not base its transportation plan on technologies that have not been proven in widespread, high density urban settings over long periods of time. (p. 9), (Exhibit 4.9)</p> <p>4. We strongly oppose amending the California Constitution to allow a 55% approval for local transportation sales taxes. Los Angeles County residents are already burdened with Prop. A and Prop. C taxes, much of which are misspent on rail</p>	

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
 (Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>projects that are uneconomical. (p. 10)</p> <p>5. We oppose the major corridor study of the US-101 because it fails to analyze the region's transportation needs in a comprehensive, systematic way. Placing the entire freeway expansion load on the US-101 makes little sense, without studying the variety of other route alternatives that should be on the table. (p. 17)</p> <p>6. We do not agree with your comment that "auto-dependence and segregated land uses, has continued to erode the Region's quality of life." Quite the contrary, separating commercial and retail uses from quiet residential streets and the widespread availability of the automobile has improved the quality of life for most residents. (p. 21)</p> <p>7. We oppose any expansion of the US-101 corridor, including widening, double-decking or rail systems on this freeway, regardless of whether or not they are in the right-of-way. The US-101 freeway runs through some of the most environmentally sensitive areas in the region, and any such expansion is simply politically and environmentally unacceptable. (p.160)</p> <p>8. We take great exception with your proposed "post 2030" long range corridor cutting a 50 mile wide path, along the US-101 freeway from Ventura County to San Bernardino County. This "Southwest Passage" strategy involving a multi-model system from SCAG to Texas, fails to consider other route alternatives. (Exhibit 7.1)</p> <p>Thank you for allowing us to comment on your Draft 2004 RTP.</p> <p>Cordially yours, Gerald A. Silver President</p>	
RTP-04-014	12/5/2003	Lacayo, Henry L.	Congress of California Seniors	<p>Concerned with RTP including the use of longer combination vehicles (LCVs) on dedicated truck lanes. Urges SCAG to reject any truck only lane proposal in the final RTP that includes the use of longer and heavier trucks.</p>	Comment noted.

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
 (Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-015	12/8/2003	Ervin, Sr., Michael J.	Peace Officers Research Association of Calif.	Reject any proposal in the final 2004 RTP that calls for the use of longer combination vehicles (LCVs) on dedicated truck lanes. Our members are concerned about the dangers LCVs would pose to other motorists as well as the bad precedent they would set for others who have been lobbying to thaw the federal freeze on LCVs.	Comment noted.
RTP-04-016	12/10/2003	Webb, Ralph H.		If the I-5 JPA could get a clarification on the significance, need, etc. for separating out I-5 interchanges Orange County line to Rosemead in the Plan element of the Draft RTP, it would be very helpful. As I-5 interchanges require reconstruction as part of HOV and mixed flow improvements, why are I-5 interchanges from the Orange County line to Rosemead Blvd. Separated out from the mixed flow and HOV elements?	All improvements to interchanges are identified as a separate improvement category and grouped in the 2004 RTP under the mixed flow category. The costs for the interchange improvements include all applicable improvements associated with an interchange, including connections to HOV system.
RTP-04-017	12/16/2003	Robinson, Joel		<p>I believe the Transportation Demand Management section is the most essential part of the plan. Although, I am not sure the presentation of the plan reflects the appropriate attitude that should be conveyed to the general public. At this point, it is the public that chooses to congest the freeways and surface streets of Southern California. Even though the public consistently complains about congestion, there are still a vast majority of commuters who are not making the slightest effort to change their commuting habits. Fixing bottlenecks will not fix the mentality of the average driver. To attain success we must focus on behavioral and environmental solutions.</p> <p>My own commute consists of riding my bike between Santa Ana and Irvine five days a week. The route is fifteen miles round-trip. Along my route, I have observed that almost ninety percent of passing drivers are alone in vehicles that have the capacity for three to six more passengers. Many of these vehicles happen to be sport utility models with more passenger space than a conventional one. Between 7:30 AM and 10:00 AM the stream of traffic is suffocating. Even though I don't have to pay for gas and my legs get regular exercise, I am regularly exposed to overwhelmingly negative stresses that make my commute feel like punishment. I can't help</p>	<p>SCAG concurs with your assessment that a full range of transportation demand management strategies and programs must be available to travelers of all trip purposes in the US-101 Corridor (SR-23 to I-110). That includes agreement with the provision of, "Additional incentives ...so responsible alternatives can be cost effective and attainable to the masses."</p> <p>SCAG's corridor-level transportation planning activity known as the Regionally Significant Transportation Improvement Study (RSTIS) process requires the rigorous examination of alternatives including transportation demand management and non-motorized transit, use of state of the art performance indicators and very importantly effective dialogue with the affected community. RSTIS is focused to achieve a balance among competing interests (mobility, community livability and the environment) and to the identification of corridor-wide improvement strategies that meets the public's needs.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
 (Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>but inhale high levels of exhaust to the point of shortness of breath, coughing, and headaches (I hope I don't get lung cancer!). The noise of traffic is erratic, jarring, and even deafening. I don't even have a bike lane for half my route. I know I am supposed to have the right-of-way, but my confidence has been replaced with intense worry. It seems that most of the bicyclists on my route are afraid of riding on the street. They would rather break the rules and ride on the sidewalk, which jeopardizes the safety of pedestrians and themselves. Countless impatient, irrational, irresponsible, and unobservant drivers guarantee that my life is continually threatened! For five miserable days I can anticipate a series of low-quality, high-risk situations. Why would anybody want to choose my alternative?</p> <p>We have created a transportation environment that is extremely hostile. What if your neighborhood was a degraded mess, bisected with major roads and freeways? Would you walk or drive to the nearest grocery store? You would probably drive, right? What if your neighborhood featured footpaths, large swaths of connected open space, minimal roads, and an abundance of natural vegetation? I bet walking would seem awfully nice. Sadly, our community is centered around vehicles rather than people. As long as we keep focusing on improving, updating, modifying, straightening, widening, recalibrating, repaving, and redesigning roads, we won't get any closer to solving the problem. We have to pay more attention to each other. Why are we still consumed with the oily blackness of asphalt? Are paved surfaces a promising future?</p> <p>Surprisingly, many residents in the heart of Santa Ana take a different approach. Latinos and other minorities can still be seen walking and bicycling in large numbers on almost every sidewalk. Most vehicles are filled to capacity with family members, friends, or co-workers. Buses are packed at peak hours. In the neighborhoods, children use the streets to play. Families use their front yards to relax and</p>	

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
 (Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>socialize with each other and their neighbors. Despite the fact that Santa Ana is one of the most congested, heavily industrialized, over-developed, and degraded cities in California, its residents have managed to place a greater emphasis on each other rather than automobiles.</p> <p>I believe funds should primarily fuel an increase in public awareness. Additional incentives must be created, so responsible alternatives can be cost effective and attainable to the masses. We need more on greenways; increased commuter education in schools and on television; tax breaks for those who utilize environmentally friendly alternatives; employers who encourage their employees to use transportation alternatives; a higher stress on the advantages of carpooling (noise reduction in neighborhoods, less traffic, etc.); and publicity/promotion for these alternatives which exceeds the frequency, efficiency, and flare of car and movie advertisements. We need less housing developments, sport utility vehicles, short-term solutions, and lazy incentives to drive. The only way light rails, monorails, magnetic rails, subways, metrolinks, and other expensive alternatives will ever be successful is if they completely replace certain roads, so it is impossible to drive the same route. Mass transit fares and frequency of departures must be competitive with the convenience and luxury of driving. We must discourage the public from seeking jobs far away from their homes.</p> <p>Many sidewalks need extreme makeovers. Besides upper class neighborhoods, most sidewalks are flat, narrow, desolate blocks of cement which only serve as a safety zone from traffic. Occasionally, a lonely tree might be sticking out of a square hole, but that's sidewalks have to offer. Sidewalks have the potential to be pleasant avenues for bird watching, relaxation, exercise, local travel, and social interaction. To allow for these and other recreational uses, their width must increase (an individual's arm length is not enough). In addition to a pedestrian path, there needs to be a designated, multi-lane path</p>	

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
 (Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>for bikes, roller blades, skateboards, and other high speed alternatives. These paths can be buffered from the busy streets by the beauty of local flora. With sidewalks expanding, roads would have to be narrowed. Such a modification would further decrease the appeal of car travel. To avoid the inconvenience of narrow roads, the public would be forced to use new or existing alternatives. At the very least, carpooling would gain acceptance. The decision to walk or pedal would cease to be foreboding and uncomfortable. Excess roads need to be restored to pedestrian-friendly open spaces (parks, habitat) with trails to navigate. Freeways should also be narrowed, so adjoining neighborhoods can also enjoy the value of open space.</p> <p>Gas prices are unrealistically low and should be raised, so it is not cost effective to drive. A car should cease to be an excessive convenience. Vehicular travel should be a last resort, only to be considered when no other alternative will suffice.</p> <p>Nobody will want to live in Southern California, including current residents, if every patch of open space is converted to a traditional housing tract or a road. Traffic congestion will never be eliminated by additional lanes or roads. Bottlenecks are bad to those who lack courtesy. To accommodate any problem only makes it worse. Space is a valuable commodity. Let us not waste it on pipe dreams to escape our own selfish predicaments. We need to take responsibility for ourselves. An enthusiastic, patient, authoritative, and helpful hand can guide us in the right direction. The solutions I've expressed may be controversial if they are instilled without thorough and comprehensible explanations. They may be feasible if substantial outreach is put forth to increase awareness at every step of the way. The public deserves consistent, responsible, and authoritative decisions from concept to completion and beyond.</p>	

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-018	12/16/2003	Kumar, Rohul	Foothill Transit	Please add the following project to the RTP: Foothill Transit Signal Priority Project - ...Foothill Transit is developing plans for implementation of a signal priority project through this area. ...Foothill Transit will work with each the cities along the 210 corridor to develop a partnership and implement the system.	SCAG has identified Operations and Maintenance funding, including ITS, to improve the safety, reliability, and efficiency of highway and transit operations, individual projects will need to compete, through the appropriate project funding categories, for available funding based upon the relative merits and performance of the individual project.
RTP-04-019	12/16/2003	Hamm, Jon H.	California Association of Highway Patrolmen	Wishes to go on record as opposing the expansion of truck lengths and/or weights within California. To be clear, it is not the issue of truck only lanes that we have concerns with, but rather the comprehensive truck size and weight.	Comment noted.
RTP-04-020	12/18/2003	Walsh, Debbie		<p>I represent the community of Mead Valley which is along the Cajalco Corridor. We are opposed to a freeway being built along this route. First, a freeway will destroy our rural community. Second, it will destroy the regional trail for Riverside County. Third, it will be extremely dangerous for our children since we have three schools right next to the proposed freeway. Fourth it will destroy thousands of acres of precious sensitive natural resources.</p> <p>In regard to the schools, there are elementary and middle schools on Clark Street, which will also be the main and only real interchange for the freeway in our area. A new school is being built just south of Cajalco on Clark and Rider. Putting an interchange so close to three schools would impose an extremely dangerous situation for the majority of the children in our area.</p> <p>Another concern is that the California Aqueduct is along this route. If a freeway were built it would have to be moved to the north of the aqueduct. Added to this is the need for frontage roads that will further increase the footpath of the freeway putting the freeway and overpass right on top of the schools, eliminating the Stonewood housing development, Masonic Lodge and fire station.</p> <p>Along with this is the fact that the only real location for an overpass would be at Clark Street. The other access onto the freeway would most likely be at Harvill Ave. This would leave Clark Street as the main thoroughfare for the majority of the traffic in the</p>	Comment noted. While the Draft 2004 RTP acknowledges the need for additional transportation infrastructure capacity between Orange and Riverside Counties, it does not call for a specific alignment, alternative, technology or mode for this corridor. The draft RTP acknowledges the need for future studies to further refine specific improvement needs in this corridor.

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
 (Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>area. All of the streets that previously went across Cajalco would be blocked except Clark Street leaving all of the traffic dumped onto just one street that is next to three schools.</p> <p>Another major safety concern is that emergency vehicles will just have one street to go from one side of the community to the other. The area is boxed by hills and this would cause emergency vehicles to travel 30 to 45 minutes out of their way. Since there are schools on both sides of the freeway this would pose a major problem for the schools along with the rest of the community in case of an emergency. With one fire station this could pose a huge problem as the community is in a fire prone area. The added response times would increase dramatically with the lack of access that a freeway would create.</p> <p>The combination of an overpass, with on and off ramps right next to schools would pose a huge safety concern to the children who are bused and have to walk to school. Since our community is made up of a large number of poor residents this is a larger problem than most other communities as most children must walk to school.</p> <p>Another concern is the tunnel that is being considered. The cost alone should prohibit this from consideration. Billions of dollars are just not going to come about through planning. There are so many problems with this project that it should not be considered. The only real solution should be changing highway 74 into a freeway where it can actually go to Orange County through the Ortega Highway. This entire problem can be corrected by simply creating real jobs with corporate offices in Riverside County so that people do not have to commute. SCAG should help the city of Riverside deal with the huge homeless problem that is creating a mess out Riverside so that no corporate businesses wants to locate here.</p>	

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-021	12/19/2003	Feczko, Michelle	Orange County SAFE KIDS Coalition	Supports of the current federal truck size and weight limitation standards. Urges SCAG to keep triples and longer doubles out of the RTP. If allowed, these large trucks on truck only lanes, would allow bigger tuck advocates to lobby to allow them on more of our roads and eventually Calif. will allow triples on all roads (like many of our neighboring states). SAFE KIDS believe that longer and heavier trucks are too dangerous to intermingle with regular traffic.	Comment noted.
RTP-04-022	12/19/2003	Vargas, Afrack	California State Firefighters' Association, Inc.	Asks that SCAG not recommend the use of longer combination vehicles (LCVs) on dedicated truck lanes in the 2004 RTP.	Comment noted.
RTP-04-023	12/22/2003	Marrero, Dios	Burbank-Glendale Pasadena Airport	Based on concerned expressed...(see comment letter)..We think that the estimated 10.7 MAP forecast in the draft 2030 RTP, as well as the earlier 9.4 MAP and 9.8 MAP forecasts from earlier versions of the RTP all should be rerun, with more realistic assumptions. Only then can a meaningful assessment be made on the role of the Bob Hop Airport in the overall future regional transportation plan.	<p>SCAG aviation staff do not believe that future general aviation operations at Bob Hope Airport would pose an absolute constraint to the airport attaining 10.7 MAP in 2030. The Preferred Aviation Plan in the Draft 2004 RTP forecasts a total of about 122,000 commercial aircraft operations and 60,000 general aviation operations per year, for a total of about 182,00 total annual aircraft operations at Bob Hope Airport. Although this is greater than the 174,000 operation forecast for 2015 made by the airport's Part 161 study, it is less than the 2010 forecast of 214,000 annual operations in the airport's recently completed Part 150 study. It is also far less than the airport's historic peak of 287,000 total operations in 1978.</p> <p>The 122,000 commercial operations forecast include about 21,000 commuter operations, including small charter/air taxi operations as well as regional jets with 60-80 passenger seating capacities. This is less than the 28,379 air taxi operations reported at the airport in 2001. It is forecast that larger air carrier aircraft will replace many smaller air taxi aircraft in the future in response to capacity constraints at Bob Hope Airport and in the entire Southern California aviation system as well.</p> <p>The 60,000 general aviation operations forecast is based on a RADAM model capacity analysis that examined the total number of aircraft operations that would be allowable at Bob Hope Airport with a 10.7 MAP forecast. The capacity analysis accounted for airspace separation and runway/ taxiway acceptance and clearance requirements in mixing air carrier and generation aviation operations at the airport. The 60,000 forecast number is less than the 74,131 general aviation operations reported in 2001 (both itinerant and local) and the 74,205 general aviation operations forecast in the airport's Part 161 Study. However, general aviation operations at the airport have been declining markedly</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
 (Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
					<p>over the last two decades, from a high of 231,257 in 1978 to 134,396 in 1990 and 74,131 in 2001. Assuming 60,000 general aviation operation in 2030 is entirely consistent with this trend, even while allowing for a significant increase in corporate (jet) general aviation operations, to at least half the 60,000 total. It is anticipated that market forces will continue to displace small and slow propeller-driven aircraft from capacity constrained urban airports in the future, which is also planned to occur at John Wayne Airport in conjunction with the airport's new Settlement Agreement forecast of 10.8 MAP. This will have beneficial impacts in enhancing airport capacity utilization since faster jet general aviation aircraft take up less airspace and runway/ taxiway capacity per operation than smaller, slower aircraft.</p> <p>SCAG's Aviation Task Force approved the three remote gates assumed at Bob Hope Airport in the Preferred Plan with no debate (our Aviation Technical Advisory Committee also reviewed the concept). The gates are consistent with the direction given to staff by the Task Force to moderately expand urban airports that serve as relievers to LAX, to help meet forecast demand, but with no major new facilities or disruption of airfield operations. Compared to the aviation plan adopted for the 2001 RTP, the Preferred Plan expands John Wayne Airport by 28.6%, Long Beach by 26.7%, and Bob Hope by 13.8%.</p> <p>The remote gates would not be needed to reach for Bob Hope Airport to reach the long-term forecast of 10.7 MAP until after the year 2020. This leaves ample time for long-range planning for the implementation of the remote gates, including addressing issues of potential conflicts with long-term leases on the property, which will expire in 2014.</p> <p>It is recognized that at 10.7 MAP, existing terminal facilities as currently configured would be highly congested, and improvements will likely be needed to enhance the processing and flow of passengers through the airport's terminal system. However, the RADAM capacity analysis indicates that that there are no critical overriding capacity constraints in the current terminal facilities that would preclude Bob Hope Airport from serving 10.7 MAP if sufficient aircraft capacity is provided. It should be noted that in 1989, before the opening of its new terminal, John Wayne Airport served about 4.5 MAP with its old 28,600 sq.-ft. terminal, or 157 passengers per sq. ft. At 10.7 MAP, the existing 165,000 sq.-ft. terminal at Bob Hope Airport would serve about 65 passengers per sq.-ft., less than half what the old John Wayne terminal served. It is forecast that despite the new security measures imposed after the events of September 11, 2001, future technologies including automated ticket processing and automated passenger and baggage screening will greatly</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
 (Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
					<p>improve efficiencies in processing and handling passengers over the next 25 years.</p> <p>The Preferred Plan assumes that 757 aircraft would comprise only 2.4% of total air carrier departures (about eight operations per day). It has been determined that this activity can be accommodated without placing undue burdens on existing terminal and airfield facilities. Information on the exact 2030 fleet mix at Bob Hope Airport forecast by the Preferred Plan has been previously conveyed to your staff.</p> <p>Lastly, it should be noted that the Preferred Aviation Plan in the Draft 2004 RTP, which is updated every three years, is a long-range vision for meeting future regional aviation demand. Its implementation depends on cooperation and collaboration between all of the airports in the region. We look forward to continuing to work with the Bob Hope Airport Authority in developing a realistic and feasible implementation plan that will help realize this vision.</p>
RTP-04-024	12/23/2003	Depew, James		<p>After having read the 2004 Regional Transportation Plan it seems that there is a glaring omission. No mention of homeland security at all. Is no one at SCAG concerned that the arrival and departure corridors for five of the major airports are located over our metropolitan areas? A pilot with the intent to harm vast numbers of people could get within 10 to 15 seconds of downtown LA, Long Beach, Santa Ana, Riverside or the San Fernando Valley without raising anyone's suspicion. Cargo aircraft arriving from foreign countries with unknown cargos, and crews, routinely cross downtown LA at less than 10,000 feet and only 10 seconds, or less, from impact on, for example Bunker Hill, at midday. The fact that no person or group will standup to LAWAs and say we need to at least look at the relocation of our major hub airport from the LA basin to someplace more secure, prior to spending 30+ billion dollars to "improve LAX", smacks more of politics than of planning.</p>	<p>Homeland security is the responsibility of the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) and is beyond the scope of SCAG's 2004 Regional Transportation Plan. However, new security procedures that have recently been enacted at airports in the region in response to TSA mandates have been reflected in the aviation forecasts in the 2004 Regional Transportation Plan.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-025	12/31/2003	Del Guercio, Stephen A.	City Of La Canada Flintridge	<p>1. City objects to the inclusion of the SR-710 "gap closure" project as part of the RTP.</p> <p>2. The RTP makes no provisions for ensuring that impacts of the Baseline have been mitigated prior to implementation of the Plan. How is the RTP going to address the increasing deficiencies in the Baseline, much less the proposed plan?</p> <p>3. The impacts on the Baseline have increased with no proposed mitigation. Additionally project level environmental analysis is necessary to determine what mitigation is needed now, prior to extension of the SR-710 to the I-210. The City prefers transportation dollars spent on more cost-effective projects that will take automobiles and trucks off the highways. Such projects include the eastern extension of the Gold Line, and the Alameda Corridor East.</p> <p>4. The City supports the position of the city of South Pasadena regarding the Multi- Modal Alternative: A Low-Build Approach to the 710 Freeway Extension.</p>	<p>1. 710 Gap Closure General: SCAG has determined that the 710 Gap Closure represents an important regional need. The 710 Gap Closure has been included in previous Regional Transportation Plans, including the 2001 RTP. Funding for the completion of the first phase of the 710 Gap Closure between Valley Blvd. and Huntington Drive has been included in the 2002 RTIP and this segment is scheduled to be completed by 2010.</p> <p>2 and 3. Comment related to baseline impact mitigation: The Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) for the 2004 RTP provides regional-scale environmental analysis and includes generally feasible mitigation measures designed to minimize adverse environmental impacts associated with implementing the RTP. These mitigation measures are applicable to projects in the 2004 RTP (including projects in the No Project Alternative). Mitigation, such as sound walls, will be implemented for appropriate projects in the RTP as the projects are implemented. The purpose of mitigation is to minimize environmental impacts caused by new or expanded transportation infrastructure. At the regional scale, the PEIR identifies that implementation of the RTP may cause significant adverse health effects (Section 3.4 of the RTP PEIR). Project-level environmental analysis will be conducted by implementing agencies as specific projects are implemented. In addition, SCAG supports the continued planning and programming of mitigation measures identified in the 1998 Record of Decision regarding the 710 Gap Closure.</p> <p>4. Comment duly noted.</p>
RTP-04-026	1/5/2004	Cleary-Milan, Macie	Transportation Corridor Agencies	<p>1. The timetable for budget crisis adjustments be discussed publicly in advance of the RTP adoption and made clear to all project sponsors.</p> <p>2. Page 29, table 1.2. Please include Transportation Corridor Agencies under "Other Operators and Implementing Agencies".</p> <p>3. Page 36, Table 2.1 All draft forecasting figures that allocate Orange County growth must be updated to match on-going negotiations between SCAG, Orange County COG and the Center for Demographic Research.</p> <p>4. Exhibits 2.1- 2.6. TCA requests the opportunity to review revised population and employment exhibits.</p>	<p>1. Indeed, the Governor's State Budget proposal may have an impact on transportation funding for the SCAG Region. Information available to date, however, is preliminary. As more finalized information becomes available, appropriate adjustments and analyses would be incorporated.</p> <p>2. Comment noted. Correction will be incorporated in the final RTP.</p> <p>3. The proposed final RTP will contain revisions to forecasted growth for the Orange County sub-region in response to various comments as well as on-going discussions.</p> <p>4. Revised tables will be included in the proposed final RTP to be recommended to the Regional Council in April.</p> <p>5. Comment noted.</p> <p>6. Comments regarding innovative financing: SCAG agrees that in</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>5. Pages 55-62 has no mention of private sector finance.</p> <p>6. Page 65. The Draft RTP no longer includes a goal that encourages innovative financing. Please restore the goal.</p> <p>7. Page 68, Table 3.1. Add a footnote that the performance outcome is an expected system wide result at the end of 27yrs.</p> <p>8. Page 83, table 4.4. The text on page 83 should be amended to say the definition of HOV's is "HOV and its pricing alternatives".</p> <p>9. TCA requests the opportunity to review the locations of activity centers in Orange County prior to 2/9/04.</p> <p>10. Page 97, should say "Transportation Corridor Agencies" (not Authorities).</p> <p>11. Page 97. User-fee backed projects include San Joaquin Hills, Eastern and Foothill North/South Corridors.</p> <p>12. Exhibit 4.9, The Irvine to San Bernardino MAGLEV line crosses portions of the Foothill/Eastern Transportation Corridors. TCA would like to be included in future planning and discussions.</p> <p>13. Page 115. The discussion and Table 4.17 should also be highlighted in the Executive Summary and in Ch. 2.</p> <p>14. Exhibits 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3. San Joaquin, Eastern and Foothill roads are all free-flow and are priced accordingly. The roads are all priced to free-flow levels.</p> <p>15. Tech Appendices. Pages 115-116. Each toll road is a TCM. Also, there is a typo- should read AUX not AUS on the 241.</p>	<p>today's fiscal environment, innovative financing is critical. The RTP does not have innovative financing as a separate goal, but does emphasize innovative financing throughout. Appropriate edits will be made to the goals section to reflect this emphasis.</p> <p>7. Comment noted.</p> <p>8. The past two RTPs both have separate discussions of HOV lanes and toll projects. The Draft 2004 RTP format is consistent with these past RTPs.</p> <p>9. The depiction of activity centers are simply based on land use densities as shown in the Exhibits 4.3 (2000) and 4.4 (2030). The adjustments proposed in the growth distribution for the final RTP based on input from the stakeholders are rather minor. The locations of the activity centers depicted in the exhibits are not expected to change as a result of these adjustments.</p> <p>10. Comment noted. Appropriate revision will be incorporated in the final RTP.</p> <p>11. Comment noted. User fee backed corridors in this section are intended to be corridors that have comparatively more challenging goods movement issues.</p> <p>12. Comment noted. SCAG looks forward to working with TCA.</p> <p>13. Comment noted and appropriate adjustments will be considered in the final RTP.</p> <p>14. Comment noted. Exhibits 5.1 and 5.2 will be corrected as requested.</p> <p>15. Comment noted. Technical Appendix I will be corrected as requested.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-027	1/5/2004	Rizzo, Phil	March Joint Powers Authority	1. The Commission of the March Joint Powers Authority is not supportive of 8MAP in 2030.	Preliminary capacity analysis conducted by SCAG indicates that the capacity of March Field's one runway, with forecast military operations, is about 10 MAP. As a comparison, the capacity of San Diego International's one runway has been estimated at 18.7 MAP (the airport currently serves 15 MAP). Also, the 160 acre parcel on the west side of the airport that is reserved for civilian use is judged to be large enough to accommodate a passenger terminal serving 8 MAP. As a comparison, up until recently the Burbank Airport Authority was considering building a new terminal on a 130 acre parcel it had acquired, which was adequate for a 20 gate passenger terminal complex serving 14 MAP (although it was being planned with only 14 gates). It is acknowledged that March Inland Port is more focused on cargo operations in the short-term. At the request of the March Joint Powers Authority, the following language was attached to the March 8 MAP forecast in the 2004 RTP: "The primary objective of March Inland Port is cargo operations. SCAG projections assume commercial passenger service not yet contemplated by the March Joint Powers Commission. Air Force Reserve activity at March is projected to remain at 51,426 annual operations. SCAG has a long standing policy to give priority to military and national defense needs." Ground access improvements in the March service area needed to accommodate 8 MAP at March Inland Port will be identified in an airport ground access element in the Final 2004 RTP. It is acknowledged that the 8 MAP forecast for March by 203 is reliant on Maglev access. If Maglev is not built, the forecast for March would likely be about 2 MAP.
RTP-04-028	1/6/2004	Guensler, Tammy		The proposed "truck only lanes" is in direct violation of the SJR 7 since it will allow for heavier and longer trailers as well as triple rigs. The California Federation of Women's Clubs requests that the "truck only lanes" be removed from the plan. (Letter attached)	Additional studies, outreach work and consensus building will be needed before a final decision can be made relative to whether or not LCVs should be allowed. The 2004 RTP recognizes the need for this additional work.

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-029	1/6/2004	Priester, Scott	City Of Barstow	<p>1. Pg. 79-80 (Reality Based Vision), it is noted that most jurisdictions provided input during the Growth Visioning process, but most of these tenets noted are difficult at best, and impractical at worst to implement, which is contrary to SCAG's classification of them as "reality-based."</p> <p>2. Pgs.104-105 (Maglev System) - There is no discussion of the project being evaluated by the California-Nevada Super Speed Train Commission and financially supported by several San Bernardino County cities and the Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District. Although Exhibit 4.9 identifies it, there should be some discussion of this project.</p> <p>3. Pages 115-116 (Development Mitigation Fee), While this funding source proposal is currently being evaluation by SANBAG and its member jurisdictions, there has been no decision whether it will be established. This funding source may not exist, and may or may not take effect until 2010 if it is approved. This should be appropriately noted in any discussion about this "potential" funding source.</p>	<p>1. Land use measures described on page 79-80 of the Draft RTP can be implemented in various places around the region, and incremental improvements in these areas are likely. Across the board implementation of these land use patterns is not envisioned or necessary for this RTP.</p> <p>2. The California Nevada Super Speed Train Commission's Maglev proposal is included as a study in the RTP. SCAG did not include this project as a construction project due to financial constraint standards set for the transportation plan by federal regulations.</p> <p>3. SCAG recognizes that the proposed development mitigation fees for San Bernardino County are subject to further discussion and approval. The 2004 RTP indicates that further study is required. Additionally, the RTP text refers to polling conducted in January of 2003 indicating support by a majority of county voters for mechanisms ensuring that new development pays a portion of the cost of new transportation improvements.</p>
RTP-04-030	1/7/2004	Thouvene II, Martin E.	City of Upland Police Department	Urges SCAG not to recommend the use of longer combination vehicles (LCVs) on dedicated truck lanes in the 2004 RTP. Very concerned that if LCVs are allowed on the truck lanes, they will have to be given reasonable access on and off designated routes—then they will inter-mingle with regular motoring traffic and will result in a very unsafe situation for the general motoring public.	Comment noted.

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-031	1/7/2004	Wagner, Jack		<p>1. The SCAG Preferred Aviation Plan does not meet unconstrained demand. The region's in ability to meet unconstrained demand will have an economic cost of \$14 billion dollars and a loss of 98,000 jobs. The plan should address the impact of lost jobs and dollars.</p> <p>2. There was no reference to "Origin and Destination (O & D)" areas in the SCAG region plan. Without knowing the O & D passenger numbers at the sub-regional level, like RADAM zones, a responsible ground transportation analysis of air passengers cannot be accomplished. The RTP should display, in graph format, the Orange County demand, JWA capacity limits, a reasonable allocation of LGB associated with Orange County O & D passengers, and therefore, the significant unmet demand that must be allocated to other airports.</p> <p>3. OCRAA is particularly concerned because Orange County's current and projected passenger demand cannot be met by JWA. In fact, it exceeds the current and projected capability of both JWA and LGB combined. At the current rate of passenger growth at JWA and LGB, those airports will be at the "2030 Preferred Aviation Plan limits" by 2006. The economic implication of not being able to meet the unmet demand should be addressed along with realistic proposed actions and timelines necessary to avoid adverse impacts, such as significant increases in airfares and additional burdens placed on ground transportation corridors.</p> <p>4. Based on the timeframe when MAGLEV will be available to Orange County (page 107 of the draft RTP shows capital costs for the two Orange County MAGLEV routes to Union Station and LAX not being completed until 2030, and the route from Orange County to San Bernardino not being started until sometime after 2030), it is readily apparent that the RTP does not accommodate Orange County at all</p> <p>5. PMD, SBD and March are unrealistic airports for Orange County passengers, even with the proposed</p>	<p>1. The unconstrained forecast is a highly theoretical forecast, which assumes no capacity constraints at any of the airports in the region, and no load factor constraints on flights. For this reason it only is used for comparative purposes, to estimate the theoretical loss of economic benefits associated with falling short of the unconstrained forecast.</p> <p>2. The Aviation appendices in the Final RTP will show O&D passenger demand by RADAM zone and by county served by each airport in the Preferred Aviation Plan, including John Wayne Airport and Long Beach Airport constrained to 10.8 and 3.8 million air passengers, respectively.</p> <p>3. Comment noted. A significant number of Orange County air passengers would also be served by March Inland Port in the Preferred Aviation Plan. The Final 2004 RTP will also include an airport ground access element, showing ground access improvements and associated costs needed to implement the Preferred Plan. If the Preferred Plan is implemented, with efficient Maglev linkages and other access improvements to airports, there should be no significant increases in airfares or other significant adverse economic impacts associated with meeting unmet demand.</p> <p>4. Feasibility studies have been completed for LAUPT to Anaheim and are in the final analysis phase for the LAX to Irvine segment. The feasibility study for the Orange County to San Bernardino Maglev segment will be initiated shortly. The current Maglev deployment schedule allows flexibility dependent on funding, public support and project feasibility. Orange County is a critical component of the inter-regional Maglev system.</p> <p>5. Maglev travel times from Orange County to March Inland Port, San Bernardino International and Ontario airports will be shortened by express service for air travelers, with fewer intermediate stops. Comment noted regarding additional transportation corridor needed.</p> <p>6. Comment noted. The 2004 RTP includes consideration of an additional corridor between Orange County and Riverside County. Details of the new corridor are being specified through the CETAP planning process.</p> <p>7. Table 2.3 on page 48 will be corrected to show the correct fare box recovery for Orange County. The text will also be edited to correctly refer to fare box subsidy ratios (ranging from 22 to 47 percent) and subsidy levels of \$870 million annually. The reason for using 42% was that since part of the County property taxes are dedicated to public transit, therefore, are "technically" counted as part of the "generated</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>MAGLEV system because travel time to/from the airport will still be unrealistic, given the number of transportation mode changes, and the number of station stops that will be demanded by local jurisdictions. The bulk of Orange County passenger demand is generated by South Orange County. The question is how do passengers from south Orange County get to ONT in a reasonable time, given current and projected road conditions on the 55/57/91/71? An additional transportation corridor is required to get to ONT.</p> <p>6. The SCAG Preferred Aviation Plan includes 12.8 MAP at Palmdale and 8 MAP at March. OCRAA considers the projected utilization to be totally unrealistic based on demographic projections and the lack of interest of the local communities, which as we know, will eventually grow into community opposition. Setting aside community opposition, access to March from Orange remains unrealistic unless an additional direct transportation corridor is constructed between Orange County and Riverside County. Any proposed expansion of the SR91 corridor between SR 55 and I-15 is a significant engineering and economic challenge.</p> <p>7. The "Farebox Recovery for Orange County" appears to be wrong on table 2.3 on page 48. It looks as if it should be 47% instead of 42%. The text in the paragraph above the chart incorrectly states the situation. The sentence "Table 2.3 summarizes the subsidy labels for transit in the region, which ranged from 21 percent and 42 percent..." is incorrect. Those figures are farebox recovery percentages. To keep the theme of the paragraph (subsidy levels for transit in the region are very high and should be reduced) consistent. The paragraph and chart should show the percent of each ride that is subsidized. In addition, since the paragraph states that subsidy levels can be reduced, it should be specific in how they can be reduced. It is apparent that the amount of money spent on public subsidy of transit in Los Angeles County is too high (between three to six times higher than other counties).</p>	<p>revenues".</p> <p>8. Comment noted.</p> <p>9. Comment noted.</p> <p>10. Comment noted. The Final 2004 RTP will show 2010 and 2020 interim forecasts for the Preferred Aviation Plan in the technical appendices.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
 (Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>8. OCRAA needs significant additional rail capability that does not interfere with out congested roadways (grade separation mandatory). This problem should be the focus of our national economic security, and SCAG should emphasize the urgent need for federal intervention and funding of projects that meet this essential demand.</p> <p>9. The "Travel Supply, Demand and Population Trends" chart on page 44 tells the whole story of our problem. We need additional transportation corridors and we need them quickly.</p> <p>10. It is highly recommended that the SCAG RTP and the Preferred Aviation Plan in particular, display in five-year increments, demand and capacity and performance indicators. When this is shown, the problem we face will be apparent. As currently written, the RTP is not a plan, but a pipe dream saying "here we are today, and this is what it will look like in 2030". If the SCAG region is to vie for precious federal and rare state dollars, we have got to demonstrate that we can produce a plan that is realistic and achievable.</p>	
RTP-04-032	1/8/2004	Messina, Barbara		The 2004 RTP must consider air quality impacts of asthma in Alhambra from traffic using arterials in the absence of the 710 freeway extension (completion). Three fifth-graders in Alhambra have died from asthma complications in the last two academic years, and asthma is the major cause of student absenteeism. There are six schools in Alhambra on major arterials and another elementary school would be impacted by the Valley connector road to Mission.	The draft 2004 RTP contains the 710 extension project.

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-033	1/9/2004	Stevens, Michael		SCAG's mission statement is misleading, particularly the part that reads "leadership, vision and progress...As the largest regional planning agency in the nation, encompassing six counties, 187 cities and a boasting a 75-member Board—SCAG should have unparalleled political clout to "make things happen." Where's the leadership, the progress? It appears that all that SCAG does is "plan". You update the Regional Transportation Plan every three years, but all you talk about is what is needed and why it can't happen. You're masters at planning and studying what's wrong and devising solutions. But what's the point if they never come to fruition? It seems to me that SCAG is just another good ol' boys network that comes together to validate that they're somebody special and tries to appease the constituents by at least telling us you're planning and you have a wonderful document that proves it. If you really want to make a difference, use your political clout and start fighting for more dollars to accommodate the burgeoning growth here in Southern California.	Comment Noted.
RTP-04-034	1/9/2004	Lowry, Linda C.	City Of Diamond Bar	<p>Project:</p> <p>1. SR57/SR60 interchange: The Draft Plan includes \$1.1 million in the Baseline for the LACMTA to conduct a MIS...While that number is likely to be low, Diamond Bar requests that the 2004 RTP should include \$500 million in funding as a "placeholder" until the results of the MIS are known.</p> <p>2. Rte 60 Lemon Ave. Ramps: On and Off ramps at Lemon Ave have been identified by Caltrans and Diamond Bar as being needed to provide access to employment sites in the City of Industry and relieving congestion on Diamond Bar streets. Diamond Bar requests that these ramps be added to the 2004 RTP project list.</p> <p>3. The RTP includes Tonner Canyon (Four Corners): new arterial corridor connecting Chino Hills with SR-57 with 2 lanes each direction...The completion date is listed as 2025. Diamond Bar requests that the completion date for the Tonner Canyon project be changed to 2015.</p>	<p>Response to comments on projects:</p> <p>1. The SR-57/SR-60 interchange improvement is a Plan project to be completed by 2025 (page I-160 of the Technical Appendix I).</p> <p>2. The project may be listed in the RTP, but the discretion to prioritize and fund this project lies with the LACMTA, through their Call for Projects process.</p> <p>3. Comment noted.</p> <p>Response to comments on Growth:</p> <p>1. A revisions to the proposed final RTP as suggested in the comment has been made.</p> <p>2. The land use measures included in the RTP do not, in any way, limit or curtail the authority of local governments. SCAG is committed to working with local governments beyond the adoption of this RTP to seek land use policies that achieve mutual benefit.</p> <p>Response to comments on System Preservation:</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>Growth:</p> <p>1. Chapter 1, page 22, 2nd paragraph, Diamond Bar requests that the language be changed to read: "SCAG is prepared to conclude that MANY Southern Californians will accept future development that features higher densities, in-fill development, mixed-use land, and increased transit usage, ALTHOUGH SCAG ALSO RECOGNIZES THAT THE POTENTIAL FOR SUCH DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS VARIES WIDELY THROUGHOUT THE REGION." (change in all caps).</p> <p>2. The Draft RTP states that "the Growth Vision Alternative maintains consistency with local General Plans through 2010" (pg 22). Similarly, the Plan states that "The Growth Vision Alternative respects local input through 2010 with adjustments occurring only after a ramp up period intended to establish consensus on an implementation strategy (p. 80). The Plan is silent on what happens after 2010. The language as written could be read to imply that cities autonomy and prerogatives with respect to growth and land use decisions may be eroded or even usurped in 2010. Diamond Bar requests clarification of the intent, and further asks that a statement be included to the effect that "nothing that is being recommended in the 2004 RTP is meant to imply or any change in the authority of cities to make land use and economic development decisions that they feel to be in the best interests of their residents and businesses."</p> <p>System Preservation:</p> <p>1. Previous RTPs observed that the region would have to radically increase the amount spent on system preservation in order to reverse and reduce the backlog of deferred maintenance. Diamond Bar recommends that the amount of new funding for system preservation be increased to \$13 billion.</p> <p>2. Diamond Bar requests that the \$6.56 billion of additional funding for system preservation be divided equally between the state highway system and local</p>	<p>1 and 2. SCAG strongly agrees with the importance of preserving our aging infrastructure. Note that the increase in preservation for State Highways is higher than arterials primarily because Baseline funding for State Highway Preservation are projected to decline whereas Baseline funding for arterials is expected to grow over the Plan period. Total Baseline funding for State Highway preservation adds up to \$5.45 billion whereas Baseline funding for arterials adds up to \$8.5 billion.</p> <p>Response to Comments on Goods Movement:</p> <p>1. The determination of study parameters for the Eastern Gateway Freeway Corridor will be established by agency sponsors of the study at the time the study proceeds and will conform to all the requirements of a Major Investment Study as outline by the appropriate federal and state agencies.</p> <p>2. Comment duly noted. SCAG will continue to work with MTA collaboratively on relevant Goods Movement Studies and avoid duplication to the extent possible.</p> <p>3. The determination of feasible funding strategies will be one of the aspects of the eventual study.</p> <p>4. The 2004 RTP proposes over \$2.0 billion in public transportation funds for implementation of the grade separation projects.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>governments, and that any increase over the \$6.56 billion be similarly divided.</p> <p>Goods Movement:</p> <p>1. Diamond Bar requests affirmation that the Eastern Gateway Corridor development will be done: a) using a systems approach that considers all modes and all corridors (rather than focusing on a single "strategic route" and b) explores all operational and technology-based approaches before capital-intensive solutions are considered.</p> <p>2. Diamond Bar encourages SCAG to fully cooperate with the MTA Freight Movement Study and avoid duplication of efforts.</p> <p>3. Diamond Bar requests that conventional public funding sources (not just toll-based sources) be identified for goods movement solutions in the Eastern Gateway Corridor.</p> <p>4. Diamond Bar requests that conventional public funding sources (not just revenue raised on corridor traffic hauled by UPRR and BNSF) be identified for grade-separations in the San Gabriel Valley. The City of Diamond Bar appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Draft RTP and requests that each of the points raised in this letter be responded to in a timely and reasonable fashion.</p>	
RTP-04-035	1/9/2004	Hunter, C		<p>I would like to compliment the presentation given by Hasan Ikhata and associates at the Victorville Jan. 8 2004 workshop. The presentation was clear and professional. Response to the public comments were courteous, compassionate and informative. Their attentiveness is most appreciated.</p>	Comment noted and thank you for the positive feed back.
RTP-04-036	1/9/2004	Collier, Jeffrey W.	City Of Chino Hills	<p>1. Exhibit 4.2 and Table 4.6 show improvements to the SR-71/SR-91 interchange and the mixed flow lanes are proposed for 2030. City is concerned that improvements are planned so far out into the future. Currently there is significant traffic congestion on the SR-71 and SR-91.</p> <p>The City's Traffic Impact Analysis for the Chino</p>	<p>1. The exhibit is intended to show all mixed flow improvements on the freeway system by 2030. Widening of SR-71 between county line and SR-91 is considered in two phases. The first phase which will add one lane in each direction is in the Baseline (No-project) and second phase which will add one more lane in each direction is in the constrained plan beyond the baseline. Also, the design, engineering and right-of-way work for the SR-71/SR-91 Interchange is included in the Baseline and</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>Agricultural Preserve dated 7/16/02 recommended the addition of an HOV lane in each direction of the SR-71 between SR-91 and Euclid Ave. Exhibit 4.1 of RTP does not show HOV lanes in the Baseline, the Tier, or the proposed RTP. There is no discussion in the RTP regarding alternatives to help address the add'l impacts. Please explain.</p> <p>Additionally, please provide info. regarding the number of lanes that are planned for mixed flow improvements on the SR-71 between Euclid Ave and SR-01.</p> <p>2. The City is concerned that there is a gap in the completion of the HOV lane connection on the SR-71 freeway.</p> <p>3. Table 4.6 lists the implementation schedule for the I-215 (SR-60/SR-91/I-215 to San Bernardino Co.) in Riverside is 2025 and the I-215 (Riverside Co to SR-30) in San Bernardino Co. is 2010. For a usable segment, these projects need to be constructed at the same time.</p> <p>4. City questions the implications of integrating growth vision strategies will have on local agencies land use authority. Chap. 6 lists some actions to promote the growth vision strategy but the action are very general and do not provide details on the incentive mechanism, etc. A lot more discussion will be needed to obtain local agency(ies) acceptance of this strategy.</p>	<p>the construction is included in the constrained plan.</p> <p>2. City's concern about the potential gap in HOV system on SR-71 is valid and duly noted. SCAG will work with the RCTC and evaluate and consider closing the HOV gap in the future RTP update.</p> <p>3. Comment duly noted. The project completion year will be coordinated between SCAG, SANBAG and RCTC and appropriate correction will be reflected in the final RTP.</p> <p>4. Land-use assumptions in the Draft RTP do not limit local land-use authority. Further, specific local actions to support the land use strategy are not assumed prior to 2010. Beyond the adoption of this RTP, SCAG will continue its COMPASS/Growth Visioning effort in order to refine implementation strategies and incentives, and in order to seek opportunities for mutual benefit.</p>
RTP-04-037	1/12/2004	Romero, Charles D.		<p>Supports MetroLink Rail roads. Need to run a line to Redlands March AFB, Perris and on to Temicula, Calif.; Need to spend more money on mass transit. Tunnel under the mountain for autos is a waste of money. Reche Canyon Route can be improved and a big savings by expanding it even more. Also we have to improve 60/91/I-215 intercity ASAP.</p>	<p>The Southern California Regional Rail Authority (SCRRA) is planning to expand the San Yesidro branch line along the I-215 corridor including Perris and a station at March AFB with potential future expansion southward. Additionally, various options in San Bernardino County for possible expansion of Metrolink services to Redland is under review.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-038	1/12/2004	Ledford, James C.	North County Transportation Coalition	<p>1. Urges SCAG to include the entire I-5 to I-15 High Desert Corridor (HDC) in the RTP within the Potential Solutions Chapter. The HDC was mentioned in the 2001 RTP as a "planned but unfunded" project. This is not an appropriate current description for the HDC since implementation of the HDC is underway. A better description of the HDC in the 2004 RTP is as follows: "being implemented without conventional regional/state/federal tax funding."</p> <p>2. Urges the inclusion of HOV lanes on I-5 from SR-14 to SR-26 in the RTP 2030 HOV System. Also requests that you include in the RTP Truck Climbing Lanes on the I-15 from SR-14 to Calgrove Blvd.</p> <p>3. Has more specific comments to add projects (see comment letter)</p>	<p>1. While elements of the High Desert Corridor (HDC) project is in the constrained 2004 RTP, HDC in its entirety is identified as a post 2030 long range corridor. HDC will be considered for inclusion in the future RTP upon completion of the local processes and funding commitment of the county commissions.</p> <p>2 and 3. Comment noted. RTP is required by law to be financially constrained. What that means is that the plan must demonstrate reasonably that every project and program identified in the plan will have the necessary funding to implement them within the time horizon of the plan. As indicated in the Draft 2004 RTP, the county of Los Angeles has a deficit of over \$3 billion even to meet existing commitments without new funding initiatives identified in the plan. Even with the new funding initiatives, Los Angeles County has only \$12 billion. Additional half cent sales tax assumed for LA County accounts for a large share of this new funding, which comes with committed expenditure plan. That leaves the region with very little flexibility to add new projects in the constrained portion of the plan. However, the technical appendix of the plan does include a list of unconstrained projects. There is an unmet need of over \$80 billion in this region. Staff will include this project in this unconstrained list of projects. Should the funding scenario change in the next planning cycle, inclusion of the projects in the unconstrained list will ensure consideration of the projects for future funding.</p>
RTP-04-039	1/12/2004	Heston, Guy B.	Long Beach Transit	<p>1. Page 89, statement.."strategies include significant increase in service availability.." this seems oriented to BRT and Metrolink. The basis bus routes throughout the county carry most of the riders. (see letter)</p> <p>2. The financing strategies on pages 95-96 should also be included in the Funding Strategies beginning on page 113.</p> <p>3. The status of the section called "Other Recommendations" (page 95) is unclear. Is this part of the main plan recommendations? If so, why aren't they presented as other plan recommendations are?</p> <p>4. Please clarify this item recommended by the Regional Transit Task Force: "Fare structures must be designed so that the transit customer is not penalized when transferring between vehicles, modes or carriers".</p>	<p>1. The Plan clearly supports expansion of transit services and increasing the public's access to alternative modes such as bus. These improvements include expansion of the bus rapid transit network, commuter rail system, as well as local and express bus services.</p> <p>2. The financial strategies, delineated on pages 95-96, are consistent with the overall financial strategies for the 2004 RTP as listed on page 113. Indeed, SCAG recognizes that public funds are needed to continue investing in the region's growing transit system, particularly as our transit dependent population increases.</p> <p>3. Yes, these are part of the overall recommendations.</p> <p>4. This recommendation refers to the need for easy transfer between transit systems. Elimination of additional fees for transferring between various transit systems would result in the establishment of a more user-friendly regionwide service. The Plan is suggesting that transit systems lose their authority in setting their fare policies, but rather promotes increase cooperation and coordination among the region's transit operators.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-040	1/12/2004	LaPolla, Nancy	Emergency Medical Services Administrators' Assoc. of Calif.	Asking that SCAG reject any proposals to allow longer combination vehicles (LCVs)-- long double and triple trailer trucks—on any truck only lanes as discussed in the Draft 2004 RTP. Concerned with safety.	Comment noted.
RTP-04-041	1/12/2004	Ooms, Teri	Inland Empire Economic Partnership	<p>1. Continued emphasis on HOV as a solution. While HOV and HOT lanes are certainly a part of the solution, better processes of assessing segments are needed.</p> <p>2. Freight Movement projects and strategies - There seems to be limited consideration of policies or incentives to shift freight between trucks and trains by increasing capacity for either mode, agile port/inland port/short haul rail strategies, tolls for trucks or container fees for trains. Appropriate attention should be given to the kinds of studies that balance truck and train configuration to successfully reduce congestion.</p> <p>3. Land Use Strategies - Concerned that much of the particulars of the plan are relying on these land use strategies as solutions. It may raise the specter of loss of local control. A more collaborative process is needed to ensure proper land use strategies as Inland Empire city's rapid growth over the past ten years (for the next ten years) present challenges and opportunities for local government.</p>	<p>1. Comment noted.</p> <p>2. SCAG is presently conducting a Port and Modal Diversion Study addressing these issues.</p> <p>3. The RTP relies on land use strategies to meet regional goals and performance objectives to a relatively modest degree. Implementation of land use strategies is assumed only beyond 2010. SCAG intends to continue a cooperative dialogue with local governments to seek land use implementations that achieve mutual benefit.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-042	1/12/2004	Gherardi, Ginger	Ventura County Transp. Commission	<p>1. Although the RTP was extended for an add'l 5 yrs, it provides virtually no changes from the prior RTP for Ventura County.</p> <p>2. There is virtually no mention of Ventura County or its transportation needs in the Plan</p> <p>3. The local recommended population for Ventura Co. should be 945,000, a difference from the RTP of approx. 50,000. By over-projecting the population, SCAG is raising the bar for air quality impacts and TCMs which must then be addressed by Ventura County.</p> <p>4. Table 2.2 "Transit Service Utilization" is of little use and is misleading and counter-productive to encouraging add'l transit services. (see comment ltr.)</p> <p>5. The RTP cites the importance of fare payment system coord. but only discusses the MTA smart card (in development stage) rather than the GOVENTURA Smartcard which is used by 6 operators in Ventura Co for almost 2 yrs.</p> <p>6. The Plan does not provide a method to achieve transit subsidy reduction nor does it address whether or not reducing the subsidy is a desirable goal as opposed to maintaining low fares or providing more widespread service levels.</p> <p>7. RTP does not include major projects adopted by VCTC board in Dec. 2003 (see comment for list of projects).</p> <p>8. Exhibit 4.5 does not extend Metrolink from Oxnard to Montalvo even though this service is currently in operation. It also does not show the Santa Paula Branch Line corridor as a Transit System Corridor by 2030 even though efforts are currently underway to reconstruct this portion of rail system. In Dec. 2003 VCTC board added the Santa Paula Branch Line to its long range project priority list. (see comment letter for project description)</p>	<p>1. Comment noted. While the horizon year was extended by five years, the starting year of the plan has also moved up by 3 years. Therefore the net addition to the plan horizon is only 2 years. In addition, project delivery was hampered significantly during this planning cycle due to STIP funding shortfalls resulting in moving the same projects forward through the new planning cycle. More importantly, the RTP reflects input provided by VCTC to SCAG prior to the release of the Draft 2004 RTP.</p> <p>2. Comment duly noted. Transportation needs discussions are intended to provide a general assessment of regionwide needs without bias to one county or the other.</p> <p>3. SCAG analyzed the suggested revision. An adjustment has been made to the socio economic forecast for the Ventura County sub-region in response to this and other comments.</p> <p>4. Performance indicators were developed, to the extent possible, to provide a means to reflect the goals adopted by the Regional Council and presented on page 65 of the draft RTP. The fourth goal listed is: "maximize the productivity of our transportation system". In developing performance indicators for the RTP, SCAG worked closely with the RTP Technical Advisory Committee which is comprised of representatives from all of the county commissions, sub regions and other stakeholders. Indicators developed were first approved by the TAC, then by the TCC, and finally by the RC. Note that all indicators adopted are multi-modal in nature. This includes the transit service utilization indicator. The same measure is also used for highways and arterials. While we agree that increasing transit ridership is critical for the entire region, the RTP also recognizes that the funding constraints facing the region require all of us to seek the most productive means of delivering transit services. The transit service utilization indicator is but one element to consider. You may note that the RTP does not recommend a specific target for this indicator. It only points out that there is potential for productivity improvements for transit in the Region.</p> <p>5. Comment duly noted. SCAG apologizes for this important omission. Go Ventura Smartcard system will be included in the final RTP.</p> <p>6. Reducing transit subsidies is not a goal of the RTP and is certainly not desired if it comes at the expense of ridership. As you are aware, subsidies can be reduced by a variety of means, including ridership increases for current services. Fare increases can be counter productive if they result in ridership reductions. On the other hand, if the cost of delivering transit services rise, it may be necessary to increase</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
 (Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>9. Several grade separations in Ventura Co. should be added to the Plan (see comment letter for list)</p> <p>10. Given the recent release of the proposed state budget...."The financial component needs to be revisited prior to plan adoption to include the most updated information on available transportation funding"</p> <p>11. The plan proposes to increase funding available for transportation through increase gas taxes and local sales taxes approved with a modified 55% approval threshold. Recent polling has shown that there is marginal support for lowering the voter threshold for sales tax measures to 55%.</p> <p>12. This comment has to do with how projected revenues and committed costs for each county are presented (see comment letter)</p> <p>13. The RTP does not identify how to make up the \$3.38 billion shortfall in LA County or the \$2.96 billion shortfall in San Berdo County making the Plan financially unconstrained and in violation of the federal requirements. This may impact the ability of the region to adopt or amend a FTIP.</p> <p>14. Post-2030 Long Range Corridors: RTP identifies Santa Paula Branch Line corridor and SR 118 corridor as future corridors. It seems the timing of both the projects if off considering the net balance of funds (see comment letter)</p>	<p>fares to at least keep up with inflation.</p> <p>7. The Draft 2004 RTP was released prior to the adoption of major projects by VCTC board in December 2003 as indicated in the comment. SCAG will continue to work with VCTC to reflect the county priorities as accurately as possible in the RTP.</p> <p>8. Metrolink service between Oxnard and Montavlo is included in Table 4.5. It is shown in yellow color at the west-end of the Ventura County line. In regards to the Santa Paula Branch Line, SCAG did not receive the needed input in time for the release of the Draft RTP. SCAG will work with VCTC to ensure that the project is reflected accurately in the final RTP.</p> <p>9. The grade separations are included in the Plan and are listed in Appendix I on page I-213.</p> <p>10. SCAG staff continues to monitor the State Budget situation and fully recognizes the potential impacts resulting from the Governor's proposed reductions. Nevertheless, given that the budget related items are simply proposals at this time, SCAG will continue to proceed. Until the budget is finalized, SCAG intends to move forward with the current draft 2004 RTP financial plan. As more detailed and finalized information becomes available, appropriate adjustments would be made.</p> <p>11. SCAG recognizes the challenges associated with lowering the voter approval requirement to 55 percent. Nevertheless, SCAG continues to support the effort to modify the voter approval requirement. Moreover, SCAG supports member county transportation commissions? initiatives to reauthorize their respective local sales taxes for transportation.</p> <p>12. On page 59, Table 2.9 provides county level information in addition to the regional aggregate total. SCAG has no intention to balance deficits in one county with revenues from another.</p> <p>13. On page 116, Table 4.17 delineates the regional funding strategies proposed to make up the shortfalls in both Los Angeles and San Bernardino Counties, while also providing additional dollars to the remaining counties to fully fund all the proposed projects in the RTP. The proposed gas tax/user fee increase, for example, could be implemented on a statewide scale, meaning that all counties would realize funds through the existing STIP process.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
					14. Comment duly noted. These projects were identified as post 2030 long range improvement corridors in the 2001 RTP per input received at the time. SCAG will work with VCTC to reflect and depict these corridors correctly in the final RTP.
RTP-04-043	1/13/2004	Arvizo, Daniel		What about the growth that Imperial Valley is experiencing? Does SCAG include the possibility of San Diego County locating their regional airport and the County's relocation? I plan on flying out of Imperial County airport this year, where is their data? The maps for Imperial County lack the detail for viewing. What about Cal-trans predictions for traffic coming to/from I-10, highway improvements, congestion on Hwy 86? Table 2-1 is vague. Where is the transit data for Imperial County? What about the rail link that just reopened last year from Imperial County to San Diego? What about the number of San Diego residents who commute to San Diego/Palm Springs? What about the air quality issues that face Imperial County? Does SCAG have plans to have a presentation for Imperial County residents?	<p>Response to comment on aviation: Imperial County is still in the process of evaluating a replacement airport for Imperial County Airport, including its cargo handling potential. No new site has been determined for the potential replacement airport. SCAG will assist in this effort over the coming year. When a replacement site has been determined, it will be added to the regional aviation plan. Data was not included for general aviation and commuter airports in the region (46 total). This data will be included in the technical appendices of the Final 2004 RTP.</p> <p>Response to Comment on Transit Data: Transit information included in the Plan is based on the data that was available from the National Transit Database (NTD). In review of the NTD reports, data on transit use in Imperial County was not readily available.</p> <p>Other comments are duly noted.</p>
RTP-04-044	1/13/2004	Reina, Jose		Begin your comments here. I have been driving an Enterprise Van Pool for the past 4 years, I got a new rider and she is paying me with a Transit Check voucher, My question is How does a rider qualify for something like this? I also have a Van Rebate Authorization # 1370-D from SCAG.	Comment noted - Vanpool operational issues are handled in concert by the vanpool provider(unless owner-operated van) and the appropriate county rideshare (carpool & vanpool)agency. In Los Angeles County for instance, answers to your question may be obtained by contacting the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority at 213-922-2000.

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				My work number is 818 998-7322 x 286. Thank You Jose R.	
RTP-04-045	1/13/2004	Kater, Pat		It is impossible for me to attend most meetings during the daytime hours and usually find out about most meetings too late to plan time to attend. My wife and I are very concerned about the Freeway Plans that SCAG is planning for the 101 fwy. It seems that most everyone is convinced that should we expand, double deck the 101 that by the time it is finished the un-controlled growth of our area will put that expanded fwy in the same place it is today. This seems to make it obvious that other means are necessary to solve the problem....including limiting growth. I hear the voices saying that growth is what drives the economy. Mostly growth seems to create neighborhoods that are not healthy to live in. We have Water problems and power problems in this area with the population government is attempting to serve properly today. So uncontrolled growth is really our major problem. You can't fix a problem unless you address the entire problem and growth is the major problem....if we can't provide the water, power and gas why in the world should we spend billions on highways. We need to look at alternate ways of solving today's traffic problems and get the powers to be to focus on how we can control growth! Are we even considering one-way streets throughout the traffic problem areas-if not...why not???	<p>The 101 Corridor between the SR 134/170 interchange and SR 23 at the Ventura County Line has been identified in the Draft 2004 for the addition of the equivalence of two additional lanes of capacity to be completed by 2030. The Draft 2004 RTP also calls for significant TSM and TDM improvement in the corridor. This is based upon the longstanding deficiencies in capacity the 101 corridor, resulting in significant congestion, and increasing demand forecast in the Draft 2004 RTP. SCAG is working with affected agencies and the community to identify options, which seek to minimize impacts on adjacent communities. The draft 2004 RTP identifies innovative public/private funding options for the constrained funding scenario to pay for construction of the additional capacity on this segment of the 101 corridor. Additional needs for improved east west capacity in the San Fernando Valley and improved connectivity at major interchanges has been noted and will be the subject of future study.</p> <p>101 Action</p> <p>SCAG's Transportation and Communications Committee at its February 5th, 2004 meeting recommended consideration of the following alternatives for the 2004 RTP in the US-101 Corridor (101/110 Interchange to SR 23/101 Interchange/Ventura County Line): (a) Potential capacity enhancements within the existing right of way or requiring minimum right of way acquisition on the segment from the 101/134/170 Interchange to the 23/101 Interchange at the Ventura County line. This will be based upon the results of further consultant analysis to be completed in February 2004;(b)Extensive Transportation System Management (TSM) and transit options, as appropriate, identified in the corridor study, as well as, priority near and mid-term TSM and transit options, as appropriate, identified in the City of Los Angeles Community Advisory process for all portions of the 101 Corridor, and (c) Continued study of long term east-west travel needs in the 101/San Fernando Valley Corridor and further study of improvements to system connectivity and potential operational improvements to key Freeway/Freeway interchanges.</p> <p>Your comments related to growth and water problems are duly noted.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-046	1/13/2004	Aspray, Patricia		Remove the LCV truck lane proposal!!!! Please, Add language to the RTP to say that the truck only lanes will NOT allow LCVs.	Comment noted.
RTP-04-047	1/13/2004	Lumis, Unknown		Is against allowing longer combination vehicles on dedicated truck lanes. Is concerned with safety.	Comment noted.
RTP-04-048	1/14/2004	Armstrong, Robert		I am calling to protest any action that would permit triple trailer trucks coming into California.	Comment Noted
RTP-04-049	1/14/2004	Armstrong, Sue		I am calling to protest any action that would permit triple trailer trucks coming into California.	Comment noted
RTP-04-050	1/14/2004	Harte, Duane	Santa Clarita Chamber of Commerce	"I am writing to urge the advancement of the Interstate 5 Santa Clarita-Los Angeles Gateway Improvement Project. The Transportation Committees strongly recommend the project to be advanced to the 2004 RTP."	Comment noted. RTP is required by law to be financially constrained. What that means is that the plan must demonstrate reasonably that every project and program identified in the plan will have the necessary funding to implement them within the time horizon of the plan. As indicated in the Draft 2004 RTP, the county of Los Angeles has a deficit of over \$3 billion even to meet existing commitments without new funding initiatives identified in the plan. Even with the new funding initiatives, Los Angeles County has only \$12 billion. Additional half cent sales tax assumed for LA County accounts for a large share of this new funding, which comes with committed expenditure plan. That leaves the region with very little flexibility to add new projects in the constrained portion of the plan. However, the technical appendix of the plan does include a list of unconstrained projects. There is an unmet need of over \$80 billion in this region. Staff will include this project in this unconstrained list of projects. Should the funding scenario change in the next planning cycle, inclusion of the projects in the unconstrained list will ensure consideration of the projects for future funding.
RTP-04-051	1/14/2004	Gilley, James C.	City Of Lancaster	<p>1. I-5/SR-14 HOV connector is depicted in Exhibit 4.1, but is not identified in the corresponding table on Page 83.</p> <p>2. Exhibit 4.2 identifies SR-138 as included in the Mixed Flow Improvement Projects, however, it is not identified in corresponding Table 4.6 on page 87.</p> <p>3. Exhibit 7.1 "Post 2030 Long Range Corridors" incorrectly depicts the High Desert Corridor as "terminating east" of I-5. The HDC should be shown as "connecting with" the I-5.</p> <p>4. The North County cities of Santa Clarita and</p>	<p>1. I-5/SR-14 HOV connector is depicted as a Tier 2 project. Tier 2 projects are listed separately in Appendix I.</p> <p>2. SR-138 is depicted as a Baseline project. Baseline projects are listed separately in Appendix I.</p> <p>3. Exhibit 7.1 will be corrected.</p> <p>4. Comment noted.</p> <p>5. Comment noted.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>Palmdale are identified on all maps throughout the draft document. I would request that the City of Lancaster be identified on these maps as well.</p> <p>5. I also wish to voice support for the North County Transportation Coalition (NCTC) in urging SCAG to place greater emphasis on inclusion of the entire I-5 to I-15 High Desert Corridor (HDC) within the 2004 RTP.</p>	
RTP-04-052	1/14/2004	Nyre, Donald		<p>SCAG must set aside politics and come up with a plan based on capacity of airports and proposed airports, and not pander to developers trying to kill airports.</p> <p>Magnetic levitation does not meet the needs, there is still a shortfall of 22 MAP in forecast. Without Maglev, a more practical allocation of 154 MAP compared to 192 MAP give a shortfall of 38 MAP. There is no solution to this shortfall. The answer is to include El Toro, over the objections of the developers and FAA, and wait for that airport to be opened. Planning is a long term commitment. The local politics of El Toro can easily be overruled by the region, when the region makes up its mind to do so.</p>	Comment noted. Outlying airports including Palmdale, San Bernardino International, March Inland Port and Southern California Logistics airports are expected to attract substantial numbers of passengers over the next 25 years as existing airports approach their physical capacity constraints. It is recognized that future aviation demand will continue to be concentrated in Los Angeles and Orange counties. However, airports in those counties, including John Wayne and Long Beach airports, are all capacity constrained and limited potential to absorb future aviation demand.
RTP-04-053	1/15/2004	Low, Mabel	Woman's Club of Artesia-Cerritos	We have been informed that SCAG has proposed as part of its RTP to have "trucks only" lanes which would allow LCV. We are asking you to reconsider this current proposal in allowing LCV to use the four new sections of freeways that are to be opened soon. Woman's Club Artesia-Cerritos is opposed to longer vehicles on the highways because of the danger they can impose.	Comment noted.
RTP-04-054	1/15/2004	Burke, Catherine		It seems to me that the proposed plan is completely unrealistic. Both the state and federal governments are in major deficits, and there is no money for such things as a mag-lev train network (or even one line). An advanced propulsion system such as mag-lev does nothing to improve service to the user. Train systems lose time at stops, and stops must be widely spaced if trains are to move at speed. As a result, the majority of people cannot use train systems because the stations are neither close to where they are nor close to where they want to go, or both.	Comment noted.

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
 (Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>In essence, urban mobility in large metropolitan areas is failing, and this plan does nothing to make the situation better. The auto provides the most convenient transportation to all points in the area, but there is congestion, pollution, many who cannot drive a car, and they are truly deprived. Buses and rail can only serve a small proportion of people and trips at great cost. There is minimal service at night and limited service in off-peak hours. We need real innovation, not just cosmetics on old systems. Admittedly our mobility problems seem intractable, but what we need is new thinking, not old solutions. Recently it has been demonstrated that freeways cannot be widened without protests. In Los Angeles the MTA has had to raise bus fares, and how many Gold Lines can we build when 13.6 miles cost \$900 million?</p> <p>As urban areas become more like Los Angeles, jobs, homes, malls and recreation are scattered all over the area and in suburbs. Neither rails nor buses can serve many outlying and cross-town areas, which is why we rely on the auto. Clearly we need something better.</p> <p>Now, imagine a car that does not need gasoline, or oil changes, or a driver, or even roads. That car exists today in the U.S. and in Great Britain. Versions of that car are on the drawing boards in several countries. Think of it as a personal, driverless taxi.</p> <p>The first operating prototype in the United States has been supported with private money. It can be viewed on the internet at http://skywebexpress.com. If you go to their facility in a suburb of Minneapolis, you can ride on it.</p> <p>You can see the Ultra system, funded by the European Union, which is now being built in Cardiff, Wales. Soon that will be available to ride in the central city.</p> <p>Other ideas waiting for support can be found at the web site Innovative Transportation Technologies. None of these ideas have received any government support. SkyWeb Express, which is furthest along in development needs only \$20 million to go into full scale testing and become ready for deployment. For</p>	

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
 (Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>the cost of one mile of light rail, \$62 million, SCAG and the MTA could support full scale testing of two or three promising ideas.</p> <p>Taking SkyWeb Express as an example, this urban car operates on a network of narrow overhead monorails just three feet wide. The network is supported by small columns and can go over sidewalks, streets or open ground. The stations are off-line, so there are no stops until you reach your destination. The vehicles operate on demand and will wait for you at the station. If the system is very busy, you can call a vehicle just as you would call an elevator.</p> <p>You choose your destination on a touch screen then enter to travel alone, in privacy, unless you choose to have others travel with you. One vehicle can hold a family of four, or three adults, or one wheelchair and adult caregiver. The system remains cost effective with only a single rider per vehicle.</p> <p>Because the vehicles are computer controlled, there are no accidents. Lives will be saved, insurance costs reduced and legal entanglements avoided. As a network, there will be a station close to home, work, shopping and other major attractions.</p> <p>Communities could reduce the amount of land given over to parking and roads. As an on-demand system, it can operate 24/7 and still make an operating profit. It uses less electricity than any other transit system. It is modular, so it can be put into place quickly. A city block would be disturbed for only two construction days – one to put in the footings for the columns, and one to raise the columns and the monorail. It can also be moved or extended as the city changes.</p> <p>Its small size makes it by far the least expensive system to construct. It would also be possible for private developers, shopping malls, industrial complexes and universities to build their own systems and connect them to the network. The savings in reduced parking requirements could pay for the local system. Such a system could also carry light freight to offline stations designed for that purpose.</p> <p>In the end, there is no excuse for the lack of</p>	

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>innovation in urban transportation. The ideas are there. What is needed is the will to fund and test them. Until we have a system that is right for dispersed 21st century cities, one that is superior to the auto in convenience and accessibility, we can spend billions and still have the same or worse traffic problems tomorrow.</p> <p>Buses are better simply because they can provide more coverage of the area. They are, however, expensive to operate, operate on limited schedules at off-peak hours and at night, and they add to congestion on the roads.</p> <p>There is a better answer, one that SCAG planners have not considered. It is personal automated transit and it provides a service that for most of us would be better than the automobile.</p>	
RTP-04-055	1/15/2004	Stewart, Jim	Southern California Council on Envi	<p>There are twenty plans listed in the DRTP with no funding. SCAG should put in the money. It's embarrassing to go to the Fed's with a plan that has no real implementation. The Plan's revenue amount is not clear. Clarification needs to be made that its \$151 billion dollars not \$120 billion and should be stated in the very beginning so there isn't confusion. How realistic is the \$151 billion with cuts happening at the State level. It seems that \$30 billion for MAGLEV could be used more efficiently than this exotic technology. Was confused about what appeared in the Appendix E-43 regarding air pollution. Cannot see how the decrease in NOX pollutant can happen with the increase in SUVs. Do the figures include SUVs? How is it possible to have that kind of reduction when its known that the VMT is going up. Are these numbers the famous Black box? How are these reductions in figures going to come about? Are they Black Box reductions or are they really real that ha the actual technologies, implementation phase and everything worked out? Concerned that CARB was falling down on the job. It needs to be made clear that the Plan depends on CARB and if CARB doesn't do their job, then this Plan does not meet the conformity it claims. Additionally, there is some loop hole that enables PM 2.5 to be left out of the Plan on E-43 of the list of dangerous pollutants. PM10 is listed but not 2.5</p>	<p>Your comments about the total RTP revenue amount have been noted. The Executive Summary includes language to clarify your concerns. SCAG staff continues to monitor the State Budget situation and fully recognizes the potential impacts resulting from the Governor's proposed reductions. Nevertheless, given that the budget related items are simply proposals at this time, SCAG will continue to proceed. Until the budget is finalized, SCAG intends to move forward with the current draft 2004 RTP financial plan. As more detailed and finalized information becomes available, appropriate adjustments would be made.</p> <p>The challenges facing the region, in terms of air pollution, are real and significant. Sources of pollution under the control of State and Federal agencies do form the larger share of emissions within the region, and all stakeholders need to articulate their concern in this matter. The emissions analysis presented in the Conformity Report (Technical Appendix E) is based on the most recent emissions factor model (EMFAC 2002), as approved by US EPA. It appears counterintuitive at first glance, but it is reasonably true that on-road mobile source emissions will continue to decrease, even though vehicle miles traveled (VMT) will continue to increase. There will be more vehicles on the road, and, if past trends are an indicator, individuals will drive longer distances than they presently do, on average. But there will almost certainly also be significant improvements in emission control technologies, innovations in fuel formulation (especially in the case of diesel), and the retirement of the relatively more polluting older vehicles (the saying that 80% of the pollution is caused by 20% of the vehicles may not be literally true, but it is certainly illustrative). It is also true that the dramatic increase in SUV ownership is hindering, not helping, the</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				which the deadliest air pollutant we have and kills thousands in the Region every year.	<p>region's efforts to attain the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). However, the EMFAC 2002 model is inclusive of those vehicles. The expression "black box" refers to a hypothetical set of as-yet unidentified emission control measures or technologies that might reasonably be expected to help a non-attainment area reach its target—the attainment of the NAAQS. For the South Coast Air Basin, and in the case of ozone, the Federally designated attainment date is 2010. After we have accounted for all the controls, regulations and strategies being implemented or proposed by all the agencies involved, if there is a shortfall — that is to say, if calculations show that there are likely to be more emissions than we can control for — then this is referred to as the "black box". The 2004 RTP is a conforming plan, and its emission budgets were not based on the black box measures. SCAG is working actively with other stakeholder agencies to ensure that the region is able to demonstrate attainment of the NAAQS by 2010.</p> <p>Regarding Maglev, several independent consultants prepared the feasibility studies along four corridors in the SCAG region. All four studies concluded that the Maglev system is financially, operationally and constructively feasible. Furthermore, the feasibility studies for the four corridors demonstrate that the Maglev system can be constructed through a public-private partnership structure administered through a public agency, a joint powers authority (JPA), or a public non-profit (PNP) format using a number of innovative and traditional funding mechanisms. The construction of the system would be financed through tax-exempt bonds and Federal Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovative Act (TIFIA) program loans that would be repaid through project-generated revenues. No public operating subsidies would be required. SCAG is currently working to secure federal pre-deployment funding as part of the Re-Authorization of the Transportation Equity Act to complete preliminary engineering for the Federal Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and the State Environmental Impact Report (EIR).</p>
RTP-04-056	1/15/2004	Walsh, Carol Lee		<p>Re: Ballona creek between Jefferson and Culver in Los Angeles 90066.</p> <p>A foot/bike path over the bridge starting on McConnell on the north and going directly across to a foot/bike path on the south side of the "creek" would enable people to get across the river safely. there is a school on the north side that children on the south side will attend as Playa Vista grows. I am Carole Walsh writing as an individual. I am also the interim Secretary for Del Rey Neighborhood council.</p> <p>Thanks for listening.</p>	Comment Noted

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-057	1/15/2004	Lounsbury, Peter B.	P & H Enterprises	Requests that the I-5 Santa Clarita-Los Angeles Gateway Improvement Project be added to the RTP.	Comment noted. RTP is required by law to be financially constrained. What that means is that the plan must demonstrate reasonably that every project and program identified in the plan will have the necessary funding to implement them within the time horizon of the plan. As indicated in the Draft 2004 RTP, the county of Los Angeles has a deficit of over \$3 billion even to meet existing commitments without new funding initiatives identified in the plan. Even with the new funding initiatives, Los Angeles County has only \$12 billion. Additional half cent sales tax assumed for LA County accounts for a large share of this new funding, which comes with committed expenditure plan. That leaves the region with very little flexibility to add new projects in the constrained portion of the plan. However, the technical appendix of the plan does include a list of unconstrained projects. There is an unmet need of over \$80 billion in this region. Staff will include this project in this unconstrained list of projects. Should the funding scenario change in the next planning cycle, inclusion of the projects in the unconstrained list will ensure consideration of the projects for future funding.
RTP-04-058	1/15/2004	Barlow, Norene	Woman's Club of Artesia-CerritosAs a member of California Federation of Women's Clubs, we, Woman's Club of Artesia Cerritos have been opposed to LCVs, also referred to as Triple Trailer Trucks for many yrs. and we are asking SCAG to reconsider this portion of their Transportation Plan.	Comment noted.
RTP-04-059	1/15/2004	Bowman, Jim W.	City of Ontario Fire Department	Urges SCAG to amend the RTP to include language that would prohibit the use of longer combination vehicles on any proposed truck only lanes in Southern California. LCV are proven to be less safe than single trailer trucks. According to the U.S. Dept. of Transp. Truck Size and Weight Study of 2000, multi-trailer trucks are at least 11% more likely to be involved in a fatal crash. This is due to longer breaking distances, sway and crack the whip effect from reward amplification. ...the RTP proposes that the separated truck only lanes will be center lanes. Center lanes cause tremendous problems in responding in a timely and safe manner to an accident.	Additional studies, outreach work and consensus building will be needed before a final decision can be reached whether or not to allow LCVs. The 2004 RTP recognizes this need for additional work.

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-060	1/15/2004	Marquez, Jesse N.	Coalition for a Safe Environment	<p>General: RTP significantly inadequate in addressing transportation needs; omitted numerous transp. alternatives; omitted public request transportation projects; fails to comprehend, address and comply with environmental justice and the negative environmental and public health impacts; failed to include comprehensive analysis of total actual public cost of transp. projects. RTP failed to solicit and include participation from hundreds of environmental organizations; SCAG and the RTP are in gross error in its assumptions that the public supports the concept that the public should bare the majority burden of financing transp. projects.</p> <p>Specific:</p> <p>1. Page 1, Para 4 - Reference to the state budget crisis failed to state that part of the crisis is due to the fact: (see comment letter)</p> <p>2. Page 2, Para 3 - Reference to extensive public input failed to mention that the number of people who participated was approx. 1,000 out of 17million and did not include the thousands of organizations that should have been contacted.</p> <p>3. Page 3, Para. 6 - Reference to the transit ridership has not increased proportionately failed to mention the reason was because of heavily investing in the wrong areas and wrong type of transportation.</p> <p>4. Page 4, para 1 - Reference to crisis in transportation goods fails to state that crisis is partially being caused by Ports of LA & Long Beach being allowed unlimited port and container growth; are using antiquated non-automated intermodal systems; not utilizing Alameda Corridor; only operating at 30% efficiency;.....(see comment letter)</p> <p>5. Page 4, Para 5 - Reference to need to accommodate future passenger growth fails to state Orange Co. voted against El Toro and John Wayne expansion. (see comment letter)</p> <p>6. Page 4, Para 6 - Reference to running out of</p>	<p>General: The 2004 RTP includes a balanced, multi-modal transportation system investments within our means that were developed through a consensus process involving all stakeholders including county transportation commissions, subregions, Caltrans, transit operators, airport and port authorities. Updating the plan every three years assures that the included projects remain responsive to changing local needs. The Plan's environmental justice analysis shows that, with the exception of aviation noise, the Plan's benefits and burdens are not disproportionately distributed. Transportation finance mechanisms, whether public or private, are inherently regressive (i.e., they fall more heavily on the low-income) but the analysis shows that these burdens are not disproportionate considering the benefits received. The Plan has been supported by an extensive public outreach program that included the participation of many key environmental groups.</p> <p>1. Comment Noted.</p> <p>2. The 2004 RTP was developed with the support of an extensive public outreach program that reached approximately 5,000 residents of the SCAG region, including many key environmental groups. (About 1,000 people participated in the Southern California Compass growth visioning workshops in Spring 2003.) The outreach program involved more than 200 events, including custom presentations, public workshops and meetings, and several media broadcasts -- more events than were conducted for the 2001 RTP despite a reduced budget. Even though we are limited by time and financial resources, and challenged by the vast size of our region, we recognize that we can always improve our public outreach and participation efforts. We appreciate your constructive suggestions for increasing outreach and participation and will make every effort to improve with each RTP cycle.</p> <p>3. Comment noted.</p> <p>4. The forecast growth of activities at the region's ports are clearly identified as a contributor to the congestion being experienced in the region's surface transportation systems, otherwise see Comment No. 1 above.</p> <p>5. The preferred aviation plan assumes the airports in urbanized environments (LAX, Burbank, Long Beach, John Wayne and Ontario) to be constrained to their existing legal or physical capacity. Airports in north Los Angeles County and the Inland Empire are assumed to be unconstrained.</p> <p>SCAG has no authority to assess penalties against communities.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>options fails to state that SCAG in the past has historically not applied to available federal transportation fund programs and has opted to take the easy route by burdening the local public with bonds, increased fees and taxes...(see comment letter)</p> <p>7. Page 5, Para.3 - Reference to protecting infrastructure fails to state that SCAG has never supported a fee or tax or increased fees, taxes and financial penalties for larger governmental or corporations who use the public freeways, highways, railroads, etc. (see comment letter)</p> <p>8. Page 6, Para.4 - Reference to hwys and arterials fails to mention that the one toll road in Orange Co. has been a financial disaster and has been publicly subsidized since day one....(see comment letter)</p> <p>9. Page 7, Para 2 - Reference to Public Transportation System goals fails to include light rail, electric train or monorail systems in the RTP. (See Commentor's recommendations in comment letter)</p> <p>10. Page 7, Para 3 - Reference to Bus Rapid Transportation fails to state that all bus transit systems must eliminate the use of air polluting fuels such as diesel fuel. The RTP fails to include the support of the development and purchasing of electric buses for short distance runs. (see comment letter)</p> <p>11. Page 7, Para. 5 - Reference to Land Use Transit Coordination fails to include any mandatory compliance requirements or penalties for not supporting this item. (see comment letter)</p> <p>12. Page 7, Para 6 - Reference to Transit Oriented Development fails to include any mandatory compliance requirements or penalties for not supporting this item (see comment letter)</p> <p>13. Page 8, Para 3 - Reference to accommodating the increase in truck trips fails to acknowledge that a</p>	<p>SCAG has a longstanding policy that each county should have both the obligation and opportunity to meet its own air traffic needs where feasible. However, the development of new airports is a local decision over which SCAG has no purview.</p> <p>6. Generally, state and federal funds for transportation infrastructure are provided on a formula allocation basis factoring in population and transportation data. Of course, there are selected discretionary program funds, which SCAG seeks annually during the appropriations process in coordination with our transportation partner agencies.</p> <p>7. The financial strategies outlined in the 2004 RTP incorporates a number of assumptions such as the imposition of developer mitigation fees in San Bernardino County as well as user-fee based capacity enhancement projects for goods movement to ensure that beneficiaries help pay for the development of the facilities.</p> <p>9. The plan emphasizes the need for improvements and expansion of the public transportation system. It identifies several strategies such as expansion of BRT and commuter rail, and coordination between land use and transportation, as well as several light rail lines as key components of the transit element of the 2004 RTP.</p> <p>10. Comment noted.</p> <p>11. SCAG as the regional planning agency cannot mandate local jurisdictions to establish policies or compliance requirements. The 2004 RTP strongly promotes and encourages coordination of land use policies and transportation system.</p> <p>12. See response to Comment No. 11 above.</p> <p>13. See response to Comment No. 1 above.</p> <p>14. See response to Comment No. 1 above.</p> <p>15. See response to Comment No. 1 above.</p> <p>16. See response to Comment No. 7 above. Concluding comment related to inadequate time for public review and comment is duly noted. The Draft 2004 RTP was available for public review and comment for over 110 days, significantly more than the 45 days required by law.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>vast majority of the SCAG region's public want a moratorium on Ports of LA and Long Beach's growth (see comment letter)</p> <p>14. Page 8, Para 4 - Reference to adding capacity to the Regional Truckways Systems fails to mention that the LA and Long Beach Harbor communities and the majority of other cities and communities are against allowing diesel trucks to share public freeways (see comment letter)</p> <p>15. Page 8, Para 5 - Reference to the Regional Rail Capacity Improvement Program fails to consider alternative freight and container movement systems. (see comment letter)</p> <p>16. Page 10, Para. 4 - Reference to the Pubic Funding Strategy which emphases and recommends that the public bare the burden of all proposed transportation projects costs. We are against amending the state constitution to lower the percentage required for voter approval of new transportation sales taxes that would be charged exclusively to the general public. (see comment letter)</p> <p>Conclusion: The amount of time allocated for public review and comment on the RTP and ER is inadequate and request that the review and public comment period be extended 90 days.</p>	
RTP-04-061	1/15/2004	Denny Zane	Urban Dimensions	<p>1. Encouraged by the inclusion of Growth Visioning strategies in the Plan.</p> <p>2. Concerned with the failure of the Plan to include the Anaheim to Ontario Airport segment of the CalNevada system despite strong expressions of support by SCAG's RC. Urges that the Plan include the CalNevada Maglev system in general and the Anaheim to Ontario segment of that system.</p> <p>3. The unconstrained aviation demand projections...are excessive and fail to account for the changes in the aviation industry since 9/11 and the recent economic recession.</p>	<p>1. Comment noted</p> <p>2. The California Nevada Super Speed Train Commission's Maglev proposal will be included as a study in the RTP. SCAG has not been able to include this project as a construction project due to financial constraint standards set for the transportation plan by federal regulations.</p> <p>3. The unconstrained forecast does incorporate recent changes, including the impacts of 9/11 and the recent economic downturn on the aviation industry. It should be noted that it is a highly theoretical forecast, which assumes no capacity constraints at any of the airports in the region, and no load factor constraints on flights. For this reason it only is used for comparative purposes, to estimate the theoretical loss of economic impacts associated with falling short of the unconstrained</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>4. The Draft RTP has dropped all of the aviation policies referred to as "Guiding Principles," adopted as part of the 2001 RTP. Such a wholesale exclusion makes short shrift of the serious debate that underlies previously adopted aviation policies. El Segundo is particularly concerned that the following policies previously included in the 2001 RTP should be retained and updated in the 2004 RTP. (please refer to comment letter for list of policies).</p> <p>5. the PEIR must identify and analyze appropriate and effective measures to mitigate the negative impacts imposed on other communities by counties that fail to accommodate their own aviation demand. SCAG must:</p> <p>a) identify and analyze the level of air passenger and air cargo demand generated by each county in the SCAG region;</p> <p>b) identify where and at what level each county's air passenger and air cargo demand is being met;</p> <p>c) identify communities that are impacted by another county's aviation demand;</p> <p>d) identify and analyze the type and level of negative impacts on communities accommodating another county's demand; and</p> <p>e) identify potential mitigation measures that might be implemented to address these negative impacts, such as the proposed MAGLEV project that links Anaheim and Orange County with Ontario Airport.</p>	<p>forecast. Also, it is only mentioned in the Aviation Technical Appendices.</p> <p>4. The aviation policies in the 2001 RTP will be updated and included in the Final 2004 RTP.</p> <p>5. Refer to the response to EIR Comment No. 0018.</p>
RTP-04-062	1/15/2004	Ervin, Sr., Michael J.	Peace Officers Research Association of Calif.	<p>Believes that saying TRUCK ONLY LANES is a bad idea he believe is a great understatement. The problem is when he was driving truck, the weight limit was lower and has gone to a higher weight now, and it started with just a gradual increase to what it is now. He believes that Truck Only Lanes may work, but to increase size and weight is intolerable. Its just a recipe for disaster. If there could be a guarantee that all trucks would be perfectly maintained, all highways would be perfect condition, the weather would always cooperate, and always have patient drivers without emotions, then it would be a workable plan.</p>	Comment noted.

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-063	1/16/2004	Ortega, Carlos L.	City Of Palm Desert	<p>1. Growth Visioning Process-Some of the logistics of conducting the public workshops were flawed to the point that we do not believe the info. gathered by SCAG's consultants was sound"... The input given did not represent well-considered recommendations by people trained or experienced in the areas of municipal and regional long-range planning."(see comment letter)</p> <p>2. MAGLEV - City does not believe that a MAGLEV system is practical for the area for which it is planned, or that such a system could be operational according to the unrealistically ambitious schedule contained within the RTP.... (see comment letter)</p> <p>3. Air Transportation - "Now that Palm Springs is an international, rather than a regional airport and has recently extended their runway, consideration should be given to movement of passengers and goods into the region through that entry. Also, the facilities at March AFB should be given long-range consideration for development as a civilian commercial airport.</p> <p>4. The RTP treats the Coachella Valley as a minor player in the overall scheme of So. Calif.the amount of developable open space available suggests that the Valley warrants special consideration during growth planning. The RTP has no major transportation improvements planned to be extended to the Valley.</p> <p>5. Growth Visioning Numbers - "...the population projections from the growth visioning process are different from the projections provided to SCAG by our City Planners. SCAG estimates 700 more households by the year 2030 than does our general plan. This causes a significant concern for the City and its affordable housing program."</p> <p>2)</p>	<p>1. The Growth Visioning/COMPASS project is intended to collect input from a variety of backgrounds including both experts and lay persons. In incorporating Growth Visioning elements in the current Draft RTP, SCAG tested and modeled various scenarios in order to ensure a feasible plan.</p> <p>2. Four independent feasibility studies were conducted on the Southern California Maglev system. The feasibility studies for the four corridors demonstrate that the Maglev system can be constructed through a public-private partnership structure administered through a public agency, a joint powers authority (JPA), or a public non-profit (PNP) format using a number of innovative and traditional funding mechanisms. Nonetheless, evaluations of each segment are ongoing. Phase 1, including feasibility studies and pre-deployment analysis for the Initial Operating Segment from Ontario Airport to West Los Angeles was completed in December, 2003. Additional analysis will be undertaken through Phase 2 with preliminary engineering and EIR/EIS documentation. Four independent analyst firms and the private sector have scrutinized the financial and technological feasibility of Maglev. The initial operating segment of the Maglev Deployment Program is now expected to be completed by 2018. The outlined schedule is fully implementable pending completion of preliminary engineering studies and the EIR/EIS documents. SCAG is currently working to secure Federal predeployment funding both in TEA-21 reauthorization and Federal appropriations. SCAG is currently working with State and Federal policy-makers to allow tax-exempt financing activity for the Maglev Deployment program in Southern California. Furthermore, the formation of a Joint Power Authorities necessary to carry such financing out is also underway. Maglev technology has the ability to travel curves with up to 16° of cant and has the ability to climb steep gradients up to 10%. Average travel speeds for Maglev trains along the IOS will be approximately 112 miles per hour, far faster than speed limits on existing freeways and exponentially faster than projected average interstate speed of 17 mph in 2030. Unlike Maglev, steel-on-steel high speed rail does not approach an average speed of 112 mph and requires a governmental subsidy to maintain and operate. Maglev maintenance and operation costs are one third the cost of steel-on-steel rail. Regarding the comment that Maglev is an unrealistic concept, SCAG has been involved in planning Maglev since 1998. Numerous agencies have been involved in the development of this project, including the FRA, FHWA, CalTrans, multiple California cities, Congress and the Administration. Several studies encompassing all facets of Maglev and the Southern California region have been analyzed and repeated by</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
					<p>independent agencies and consultants. This technology is not new; but has been in operation in Germany as a demonstration project for over two decades and has operated commercially in China since 2003. Also, Germany is planning to construct an additional line in the Hamburg region. SCAG appreciates your comments and looks forward to working with the Coachella Valley as progress is made in the Southern California Maglev Deployment Program.</p> <p>3. In the Preferred Aviation Plan in the Draft 2004 RTP, March Inland Port is forecast to serve 8 million air passengers by 2030, as well as 1.12 million tons of air cargo. Palms Spring Airport is forecast at 3.2 million air passengers and 128,000 tons of cargo. The Final 2004 RTP will show the change in the forecast for Palm Springs Airport from constraining March to 2 million passengers, and extending a Maglev line from Riverside to Palm Springs Airport.</p> <p>4. Coachella Valley is an integral and important part of the SCAG region. The plan provides significant improvements to I-10 through Coachella Valley, as well as expansion of transit services including a new Bus Rapid Service to the region.</p> <p>5. The forecasted households for the Coachella Valley sub-region have been adjusted in response to this comment.</p>
RTP-04-064	1/16/2004	De La Torre, Hector	Orangeline Development Authority	<p>1. The complete Orangeline segment from downtown LA to Irvine should be included in the 2004 RTP.</p> <p>2. The 2004 RTP should support the continued planning of multiple MAGLEV segments.</p> <p>3. The 2004 RTP should recognize the Orange Line Redevelopment Agency and community support of the Orangeline.</p>	<p>1. The RTP includes the Orangeline from LAUPT to Anaheim. Feasibility study from Anaheim to Irvine has yet to be completed. This segment will be considered for inclusion in the future RTP updates upon completion of the feasibility study.</p> <p>2. SCAG supports the continued planning of multiple Maglev segments.</p> <p>3. Comment noted.</p>
RTP-04-065	1/16/2004	Fortman, Richard	City Of Los Angeles	Requests SCAG's support for including the improvements on Interstate 5 and State Route 14 in the 2004 RTP. If the MTA does not move to include these improvements in this Plan, it will be another 3 YEARS before they start the process again!	Comment noted. RTP is required by law to be financially constrained. What that means is that the plan must demonstrate reasonably that every project and program identified in the plan will have the necessary funding to implement them within the time horizon of the plan. As indicated in the Draft 2004 RTP, the county of Los Angeles has a deficit of over \$3 billion even to meet existing commitments without new

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
					funding initiatives identified in the plan. Even with the new funding initiatives, Los Angeles County has only \$12 billion. Additional half cent sales tax assumed for LA County accounts for a large share of this new funding, which comes with committed expenditure plan. That leaves the region with very little flexibility to add new projects in the constrained portion of the plan. However, the technical appendix of the plan does include a list of unconstrained projects. There is an unmet need of over \$80 billion in this region. Staff will include this project in this unconstrained list of projects. Should the funding scenario change in the next planning cycle, inclusion of the projects in the unconstrained list will ensure consideration of the projects for future funding.
RTP-04-066	1/16/2004	Shahbazian, Roy	Rail Advocates of Orange County	<p>1. There is a shortage of bus operations funds for Orange County's BRT projects;</p> <p>2. It's hard to get to/from Metrolink stations by bus;</p> <p>3. Centerline is too short and needs to be extended.</p> <p>4. Instead of Maglev, SCAG should adopt the same technology as the California High Speed Rail Authority. The proposed gas tax is a great idea. I hope you can pull it off.</p>	<p>1. Shortage of operational funds is not exclusive to Orange County's BRT projects. Transit agencies have always had shortfalls in their operation funds, therefore, requiring public subsidies.</p> <p>2. Many of the local and regional transit operators are working on improving and enhancing access to Metrolink stations. Many Metrolink stations do have feeder bus services that provide transit access to the stations.</p> <p>3. The Centerline project as approved by the OCTA Board of Directors is considered the "starter segment". OCTA will seek future opportunities to expand the Centerline beyond the current approved segment.</p> <p>4. During the initiation of Maglev, analysis was conducted on all rail alternatives to Maglev technology. SCAG, the FRA and other agencies conducted analysis to determine the costs and benefits of all technologies. Each analysis for the Southern California region concluded that Maglev provided the most feasible solution. Furthermore, maintenance and operation costs for Maglev are one-third the cost of the conventional steel-on-steel rail technology.</p>
RTP-04-067	1/16/2004	Armstrong, Bob and Sue Jean		We are writing to strongly protest any action which would allow the use of Triple Trailer Trucks in the State of California. Their use definitely increases the risk of accidents, particularly fatal ones, and obviously adversely affects the infrastructure because of the longer trailers and heavier weights. Both the General Federation of Women's Clubs, Intl and The California Federation of Women's Clubs have vigorously opposed LCVs for over 30 years.	Comment noted.
RTP-04-068	1/16/2004	Silver, Gerald	Homeowners Of Encino	Oppose Double-Decking, widening or adding express lanes to the Ventura / Hollywood Freeway.	Comment noted.

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-069	1/19/2004	Ema, Chris		<p>Congestion; Congestion; Congestion. You're starting with a 'Defeatist attitude': "We can't build our way out". Building the I-5 widening and continuing widening, shows that it can be done and solves Congestion; sure it is expensive, but NOT as expensive as 'do damage' projects such as CenterLine - just read the EIR!</p> <p>Not to solve 'Congestion', but to spend money on patches that don't solve, which detracts from building roads - which are needed. Look at your 'Cost Benefit Studies', they show that which works and don't work. Things like: Maglev, CenterLine, HOV don't do any good; but create a 'forever subsidation' for the taxpayer = an anchor chained around his neck. Tell the 'Nimbys' like it is and go about fixing it. IF, we had MPAH built for Orange County thru the years, we wouldn't be in trouble today. The same thing shows up for District 07 Master Plan, if built we would'nt be in trouble - FIX IT! Stop building HOV - you're 'Cost Benefit' and US Census show they don't do any good. People will 'Carpool' without HOV, but they'll use any lane appropriate for their destination. The Director of Engineering for US Dept of Transportation said in 1985 the same thing - "just moving Carpools over". HOV creates Pollution, which you're fighting. The vehicles are efficient at 30 to 60mph, so an HOV lane creates a chance for them to drive 65mph and above - very inefficient/polluting; thus causing mixed flow lanes to slow and pollute. The fastest way to relieve CONGESTION is to do away with HOV; you don't need to build HOT LANES - people have paid enough for roads - use it wisely! The 'soccer moms' love HOV they can drive 65mph and wave at those stuck in traffic = hardly the 'intent' of building HOV.</p>	Comment noted.
RTP-04-070	1/20/2004	Conger, Shirley		<p>1. The Plan is heavily dependent on utilizing outlying airports such as Palmdale, San Bernardino, March, and Victorville. None of these so far have demonstrated ability to attract passengers.</p> <p>2. The allocation of passengers to the outlying airports is heavily dependent on the building of</p>	<p>1. Outlying airports including Palmdale, San Bernardino International, March Inland Port and Southern California Logistics airports are expected to attract substantial numbers of passengers over the next 25 years as existing airports approach their physical capacity constraints. It is recognized that future aviation demand will continue to be concentrated in Los Angeles and Orange counties. However, airports in those counties, including John Wayne and Long Beach airports, are all</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>Maglev. ...Having this Regional Aviation Plan rest on the building of Maglev is unrealistic.</p> <p>3. The max number of passengers in an unconstrained plan is 192 MAP. In a constrained version, there would be a loss of 229,000 jobs and \$32 billion annually loss of revenue. Eliminating the reliance of outlying airports would result in a reduction in total capacity of about 20 MAP which in turn shows an overall shortfall of 86 MAP. On the other hand, even with the most optimistic scenario, maximizing the use of all airports, there still will be a shortfall of 22 MAP for the region.</p> <p>4. San Diego Co. which is not included in the RTP also has a shortage of airport capacity and exports a number of flights to LAX. With its 3 million population, an active military, high-tec industry, and home to several top level universities, San Diego is sure to grow and to need increase air passenger and cargo capacity.</p> <p>5. There is a shortfall in airport capacity without El Toro; John Wayne Airport will reach its 10.8 limit by the end of 2005, not 2015 as planned!; El Toro airport is needed to meet future growth needs in region. The week local decision, Measure W is preventing this valuable resource from being used.</p> <p>6. Preferred Aviation Plan is unrealistic. An alternative is to present a parallel, alternative plan including the El Toro Airport and allow the public to understand the gravity of the portending airport capacity shortfall without El Toro.</p>	<p>capacity constrained and limited potential to absorb future aviation demand.</p> <p>2. Comment noted. Maglev is not an untested technology, since it is currently in operation at Shanghai, China, linking the city center with the Shanghai Airport.</p> <p>3. The unconstrained forecast is a highly theoretical forecast, which assumes no capacity constraints at any of the airports in the region, and no load factor constraints on flights. For this reason it only is used for comparative purposes, to estimate the theoretical loss of economic impacts associated with falling short of the unconstrained forecast. Outlying airports including Palmdale, San Bernardino International, March Inland Port and Southern California Logistics airports are expected to attract substantial numbers of passengers over the next 25 years as existing airports approach their physical capacity constraints.</p> <p>4. The aviation forecasts in the Draft 2004 RTP do include some demand served from Northern San Diego County. It is recognized that San Diego County has limited airport capacity and partly relies on airports in the SCAG Region to serve its aviation needs.</p> <p>5. The Preferred Aviation Plan in the Draft 2004 RTP relies upon an "airline brokering" concept in combination with maximized use of Maglev to suburban airports to make up for the capacity loss associated with eliminating El Toro from the regional system.</p> <p>6. Comment noted.</p>
RTP-04-071	1/20/2004	Sewell, Ruth A.		Please stop already no triple trailer trucks in California. The safety and welfare of all California residents depends on your being more responsible and not cater to the trucking industry.	Comment noted.

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-072	1/20/2004	Seely, Melinda	AirFair	...Our group strongly supports the Preferred Aviation Plan, as shown on Page 108 of the RTP, which projects the passenger load for JWA at 10.8 MAP in the year 2030. We agree that SCAG strategy of expanding capacity in outlying airports, where the highest population growth rate and future air traffic demand is occurring, will relive pressure to further expand urban airports in areas that are at or close to build out.	Comment noted.
RTP-04-073	1/20/2004	Ham, Robert	Imperial County / IVAG	<p>1. Exhibit 2.2 & 2.3- Map does not accurately depict rapid population growth.</p> <p>2. Public Transportation - Page 47, providing some information about Imperial County would greatly be valued being that our usage is continuously increasing.</p> <p>3. Highways & Arterials - Pgs. 81-82, the stated principles do not cover NAFTA related improvements that are an essential element of many of Imperial County's projects.</p> <p>4. Regional Rail Capacity Improvement Program - Pg.99 - Discussion of reopening the Inter-County railroad line from Imperial Co. to San Diego Co. have been ongoing and the line is expected to reopen in the 2nd Quarter of 2004. It would be important to briefly discuss this to accurately reflect the current status of rail issues in Imperial County.</p> <p>5. The Draft RTP does not provide adequate discussion to border issues and Imperial County. More emphasis is needed to justify Imperial's need for add'l transportation planning due to NAFTA and the Intermodal Ports of Entry (POEs).</p> <p>6. IVAG had the pleasure to share with SCAG the 2002 Year Imperial County Transportation Plan -- Highway Element. It is an important planning tool for Imperial County and we would be pleased to see this plan form part of the SCAG transportation plan, as part of an appendix and/or attachment.</p>	<p>1. The RTP assumes population in 2030 for Imperial County to be 269,900, or nearly double the number of people counted in the 2000 Census (142,000). The map accurately reflects this growth, though the regional scale may obscure this.</p> <p>2. Information included in Table 2.2 on page 47 is based on the availability of data in the National Transit Database (NTD). Should data on transit usage in Imperial County be available in NTD reports, we will revise the table and incorporate the information.</p> <p>3. Comment duly noted.</p> <p>4. Comment duly noted. Appropriate revisions will be considered in the final RTP.</p> <p>5. Comment duly noted. Appropriate revisions will be considered in the final RTP.</p> <p>6. Comment duly noted. The Imperial County Transportation Plan was an important input to the 2004 RTP. Appropriate reference will be incorporated in the final technical appendices to the RTP.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-074	1/20/2004	Hoffman, David L.	Law Offices of David L. Hoffman	Regarding I-5 Santa Clarita-Los Angeles Gateway Improvement Project. "The proposed truck lanes over the Newhall Pass will provide for the much needed separation of "slower" trucks from the other vehicles traveling on Interstate 5 that effectively choke the roadway and jeopardize the safety of all.	RTP is required by law to be financially constrained. What that means is that the plan must demonstrate reasonably that every project and program identified in the plan will have the necessary funding to implement them within the time horizon of the plan. As indicated in the Draft 2004 RTP, the county of Los Angeles has a deficit of over \$3 billion even to meet existing commitments without new funding initiatives identified in the plan. Even with the new funding initiatives, Los Angeles County has only \$12 billion. Additional half cent sales tax assumed for LA County accounts for a large share of this new funding, which comes with committed expenditure plan. That leaves the region with very little flexibility to add new projects in the constrained portion of the plan. However, the technical appendix of the plan does include a list of unconstrained projects. There is an unmet need of over \$80 billion in this region. Staff will include this project in this unconstrained list of projects. Should the funding scenario change in the next planning cycle, inclusion of the projects in the unconstrained list will ensure consideration of the projects for future funding.
RTP-04-075	1/20/2004	Shaffery, John	Poole & Shaffery, LLP	Wants support for including the improvements on both Interstate 5 and State Route 14 in the 2004 RTP.	Please see response to comment from Mr. Hoffman above.
RTP-04-076	1/21/2004	Atkins, B.J.	Atkins Environmental H.E.L.P., INC.	Asks that SCAG consider including in the RTP, both Interstate 5 and State Route 14 (The I-5 Santa Clarita-Los Angeles Gateway Improvement Project)..."it is predicted traffic will increase within this area by 65% over the next 10 years and 114% over the next 20 yrs. Interstate 5 is part of the National Highway System and State Extra Heavy Legal Load Route System and is considered a Major International Trade Highway Route in Calif. It is also an important corridor for NAFTA as it connects and facilitates trade between Mexico and Canada as well as the Port of LA, Long Beach and Hueneme. This section of I-5 currently carries over 500,000 trucks each month. Proposed truck lanes over the Newhall Pass would provide much needs separation of slower moving trucks from passenger vehicles.	Please see response to comment from Mr. Hoffman above.

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
 (Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-077	1/22/2004	Ayres, Jim	City Of San Jacinto	<p>1. City supports the concept of an inland port that is primarily served by rail that would reduce truck traffic on major corridors and relieve congestion.</p> <p>2. City recommends that a fee program on goods processed through the LA Customs District be established to be used for improvements both to rail and highways to improve rail crossings.</p> <p>3. So as not to impact local port operations and create competitive imbalance with West Coast Ports, federal legislation should be advocated to establish a similar fee structure at other West Coast Customs Districts.</p>	<p>1. Comment noted. Such a concept would be explored in future studies considering inland port operations.</p> <p>2. Comment noted. Such a funding strategy has been proposed at the national level.</p> <p>3. comment noted.</p>
RTP-04-078	1/22/2004	Ross, Jay		<p>I'm serious about these. If you truly want to reduce traffic and pollution, you have to take these radical steps and force people out of their cars:</p> <p>1. Require one carpool lane for every three single-passenger freeway lanes, two lanes for every four lanes.</p> <p>2. Do not build new carpool lanes, reduce the number of single-passenger freeway and replace them with carpool lanes.</p> <p>3. Convert one lane of every major arterial street in Los Angeles to a bus only lane. Consider timed HOV/bus lanes, i.e. convert mid-day parking to rush-hour HOV lanes instead of another single-passenger lane.</p> <p>4. Never build the 710 freeway extension.</p> <p>5. Extend the Green Line to Norwalk and extend the OC CenterLine to Norwalk.</p> <p>6. Extend the Green Line to Playa Vista and north to Santa Monica and then to the San Fernando Valley.</p> <p>7. Build the Exposition Line from downtown L.A. to Santa Monica.</p> <p>Do you have the political courage to do this? If so, I will support you.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-079	1/22/2004	Norris, Kathy	Valencia Industrial Association	Urges the advancement of the Interstate 5 Santa Clarita - Los Angeles Gateway Improvement Project. Strongly recommends the project be advanced to the 2004 RTP.	Comment noted. RTP is required by law to be financially constrained. What that means is that the plan must demonstrate reasonably that every project and program identified in the plan will have the necessary funding to implement them within the time horizon of the plan. As indicated in the Draft 2004 RTP, the county of Los Angeles has a deficit of over \$3 billion even to meet existing commitments without new funding initiatives identified in the plan. Even with the new funding initiatives, Los Angeles County has only \$12 billion. Additional half cent sales tax assumed for LA County accounts for a large share of this new funding, which comes with committed expenditure plan. That leaves the region with very little flexibility to add new projects in the constrained portion of the plan. However, the technical appendix of the plan does include a list of unconstrained projects. There is an unmet need of over \$80 billion in this region. Staff will include this project in this unconstrained list of projects. Should the funding scenario change in the next planning cycle, inclusion of the projects in the unconstrained list will ensure consideration of the projects for future funding.
RTP-04-080	1/23/2004	Townsend, Susan E.		Please do not allow LCVs in the truck only lanes proposed by the RTP. I believe that LCVs are a traffic hazard to other drivers on our highways. Please keep our highways safe!	Comment Noted.
RTP-04-081	1/26/2004	Amerson, Joyce Y.	City of Pasadena Dept. of Transportation	<p>1. Transit - Page 48 - It is unclear if the projected transit boardings include ridership from local transit operators such as the Pasadena ARTS and Glendale Bee. It is important that the RTP includes LA County's local return operators in the evaluation of service and projections for future ridership.</p> <p>2. The Gold Line Extension from Pasadena to Claremont is vital to the continued success of the San Gabriel region and it is imperative that it remains an integral part of the RTP.</p> <p>3. Soundwalls -The process for prioritizing soundwall projects needs to be changed to allow the flexibility to address areas of greatest community concern and highest decibel reading.</p> <p>4. Mixed Flow Projects - Table 4.6 (pg. 87). The City is extremely concerned with the impacts on surface streets associated with the completion of these projects. ...It is imperative that the planning process for regional facilities address the impacts to local governments.</p>	<p>1. The source of the data used in Table 2.3, as indicated on page 48, is the National Transit Database (NTD). Upon review of the list of transit operators included in the NTD reporting, neither Pasadena ARTS nor the Glendale Bee were included.</p> <p>2. The Gold Line Extension from Pasadena to Claremont is included in RTP and is part of the transit corridor projects (table 4.9) on page 90 of the draft plan.</p> <p>3. Comment noted.</p> <p>4. Projects proposed in the RTP must undergo additional project-specific analysis that will address the impacts on local roads. Note that the I-210 project is already completed in Los Angeles County, while the I-710 project is proposed to alleviate traffic impacts on local streets.</p> <p>5. SCAG recognizes the importance of extending/growing conventional (public) funding sources for transportation in addition to the proposed private financing plan, therefore SCAG's 2004 RTP emphasizes both the gas tax as well as the sales tax as a means to continue funding transportation infrastructure. Given the limitations of public resources, however, emphasis has been placed on the further development of public private partnerships to support transportation infrastructure.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>5. Private Funding Strategy - Rather than relying so heavily on such speculative sources of funding, one could argue that the RTP should place greater emphasis on conventional - though admittedly politically difficult -- funding strategies.</p> <p>6. Future Growth & Development - City supports RTP's call for increased and better coord. between transit and land use planning. However, the City does not support the RTP's recommendation that the regional transit agency (MTA for L.A. County) be involved in the approval process for new developments.</p> <p>7. Airports - We concern with the concerns identified in the Nov. 18 and Dec. 22 letters from Dios Marrero, Exec. Dir. of the Authority and request that SCAG revisit the forecast for demand at the Bob Hope Airport.</p> <p>8. System Preservation - The amount being proposed for system preservation appears to be inadequate. (see comment letter)</p>	<p>Currently, the federal surface transportation reauthorization efforts in the Senate, the House, and the Administration have focused on including provisions to further facilitate public private partnerships. The proposed private financing initiatives in the 2004 RTP is consistent with such efforts.</p> <p>6. The RTP does not call for Transit Agencies to be involved in the approval process for development projects. An edit to the referenced section will be made to clarify.</p> <p>7. See response to comment from Mr. Marrero.</p> <p>8. Regarding system preservation. SCAG agrees with the need to adequately preserve the Region's transportation infrastructure. Note that the amounts shown in the draft RTP are over and beyond the Baseline funds estimated. However, also note that the Baseline funds in the RTP are lower than those in the letter since it is expected that revenues dedicated to State Highway Preservation will decline over time due to a number of factors (e.g., higher fuel efficiency). In total, the SCAG RTP has dedicated more funds for preservation once the additional expenditures are included. For instance, for the State Highway System, the total dedicated funds include: \$4.45 billion in Baseline funds and \$6 billion in incremental funds totaling more than \$10 billion.</p>
RTP-04-082	1/26/2004	Powers, Richard R.	Gateway Cities COG	<p>1. I-5 Corridor - Table 4.6 list this project as I-5 Interchanges (Orange Co. to Rosemead Blvd.) 2025 Implementation Schedule. There are several problems with this (please see comment letter for list of concerns) Recommendation: The I-5 JPA is also preparing comments on the handling of the I-5 Corridor in the Draft RTP. COG staff should review the JPA's comments to ensure that the COG and the JPA are offering consistent and mutually supporting comments.</p> <p>2. I-710 Corridor - Table 4.10 - Table uses the generic term "capacity enhancement" that leaves open the question as to whether there will be dedicated truck lanes, a question that will not be decided until completion of I-710 study. The text preceding the Table should be made consistent and all references to "dedicated lanes" should be deleted.</p> <p>3. I-710 project funding: The Plan should indicated</p>	<p>1. The I-5 project to add mixed flow and HOV lanes is listed in the Tier 2 portion of Technical Appendix I. The project description will be consistent with input received from LACMTA, including their adopted 2001 LRTP and 2003 SRTP.</p> <p>2. Comment noted. Appropriate changes will be considered in the final RTP.</p> <p>3. Comment noted. SCAG's Transportation and Communications Committee's action on February 5, 04 relative to this project will be incorporated in the final RTP.</p> <p>4. Comment noted. There is no basis to show implementation of this project by 2010, given the locally preferred alternative has yet to be selected. SCAG will honor the local process and await its conclusion prior to considering a revision to the completion year.</p> <p>5. Comment noted. Inclusion of this project is consistent with the panning and programming effort underway at OCTA.</p> <p>6. Exhibit 4.8 displays 2030 Plan grade separation projects, and not</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>that the I-710 Corridor improvements will be funded through some combination of conventional public funding and innovative financing techniques. The Plan should also include a minimum of \$2.0 billion in public funding for the Corridor.</p> <p>4. I-710 - the stated implementation schedule of 2030 is simply not acceptable. The Plan should show an implementation schedule of 2010.</p> <p>5. The complete Orange Line as contained in the 2001 RTP should be included in the 2004 RTP.</p> <p>6. Grade Separations - Exhibit 4.8 should be changed to show the grade separation projects in the Gateway Cities. Projects at Rosecrans/Marquardt, Pioneer Blvd. and Lakeland should be added to the third tier of the RTP.</p> <p>7. Regional Rail Capacity Improvement Program - it not clear whether the triple tracking of the BN&SF line through the Gateway Cities (La Mirada, Pico Rivera, Santa Fe Springs) is included. Recommendation: the discussion of the Regional Rail Capacity Improvement Program in the RTP should be clarified to include the entire BN&SF triple tracking project through the Gateway Cities subregion.</p> <p>8. Public Transit - The need to increase basic service needs to be clarified and expanded upon in the RTP, and financial resources to achieve this should be identified.</p> <p>9. The City of Huntington Park has identified a unique opportunity to reactivate the Red Cars on Pacific Blvd. The City is seeking federal funds to assist in covering project development costs which are estimated at \$3.2 million. The COG should request that this project be included in the RTP financially constrained project list.</p>	<p>baseline and Tier 2 projects.</p> <p>7. Additional information on capacity enhancements on the BNSF line can be found in the Los Angeles-Inland Empire Railroad Mainline Advanced Planning Study, which is available on the SCAG web site.</p> <p>8. Ensuring mobility for people without access to automobiles and providing attractive alternative for drive-alone motorists is a stated goal of the 2004 RTP. The Plan contains several strategies that include significant increase in service availability, major expansion in bus service and restructuring of existing services. The Plan also contains a financial strategy that identifies the resources needed for implementation of these strategies.</p> <p>9. Inclusion of such project in the constrained project list is not possible at this point. The City should consider presenting the proposed project to the Regional Transit Task Force for review and inclusion in the next RTP cycle.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-083	1/26/2004	Platt, Kimberly		Please do not allow LCVs in the Truck Only lanes proposed by the Regional Transportation Plan.	Comment noted.
RTP-04-084	1/26/2004	Sharp, Lee		I do not approve large LCVs in the lanes for trucks only as proposed in the Regional Transportation Plan.	Comment noted.
RTP-04-085	1/26/2004	Galaw, Mary R.		Please do not allow LCVs in the truck only lanes proposed by the Regional Transportation Plan.	Comment noted.
RTP-04-086	1/26/2004	Murphy, Marie		Please do not allow LCVs in the truck only lanes proposed by the Regional Transportation Plan.	Comment noted.
RTP-04-087	1/26/2004	Fox, Eleanor A.		Please do not allow LCVs in the truck only lane proposed by the regional transportation plan	Comment noted.
RTP-04-088	1/26/2004	Campbell, Patricia E.	City Of Seal Beach	<p>1. Growth Projections - Primary concern for the City is the long-range growth projections that are not in conformance with local agency growth projections, particularly in the years after 2010. (see comment letter)</p> <p>2. State Budget- SCAG should work with all impacted state and local agencies in addressing transportation and air quality issues with the Governor and state legislators.</p> <p>3. Land Use Policies - The City does not support a strategy whereby funding for Orange County transportation projects related to O&M of existing facilities becomes tied to local land use decisions over which OCTC has no control. The City of Seal Beach recommends removing this language from the document. However, the City wishes to clearly state that capital improvement projects, particularly those involving acquisition of public or private properties, will be evaluated independently by the City. The City has strenuously objected to the previous proposal for right-of-acquisition for improvements along the I-405/SR22 freeway corridors.</p> <p>4. The RTP includes multiple references to JPAs type agencies for implementation of various regional</p>	<p>1. An adjustment to the forecasted growth for the Orange County sub-region has been made in response to this comment.</p> <p>2. SCAG concurs with the observations stated in your comment letter concerning the fiscal, and in turn conformity implications of the State Budget decisions. Accordingly, staff continues to work with local county transportation commissions to convey to the Governor and the state legislators, the importance of protecting transportation funds. Indeed, adequate funding levels to implement the projects proposed in the 2004 RTP (both in the short term and the long term) are critical to meeting the mobility needs of the Region as well as complying with conformity requirements.</p> <p>3. Operation and Maintenance funding would not be affected. SCAG is simply recognizing the importance of coordinating the overall transportation capital development process with the tenets of the region's Growth Vision.</p> <p>4. Comment duly noted. References to Joint Powers Authorities (JPA) are included as potential organizational mechanisms to implement some of the mega projects that cut across multiple jurisdictions and would require some type of user fees to construct, operate and maintain the systems. The final RTP implicitly acknowledges that further planning, organizational development and legal framework would be necessary prior to the formation of such JPAs.</p> <p>5. Exhibit 4.9 describes the currently proposed Maglev system in its</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>projects. The Final RTP should clarify these JPAs as conceptual implementing agencies, and acknowledge that further planning and organizational structures have to be developed when the timing is appropriate.</p> <p>5. Maps showing the Maglev system (Exhibit 4.9) should include all proposed state and regional projects in addition to SCAG's planner system to provide the reader with a regional context of multiple ongoing planning efforts. The Cal-Nevada High Speed Rail Commission has an adopted alignment that Exhibit 4.9 should show.</p> <p>6. There is also an Major Investment Study (MIS) being conducted by OCTA along the I-405 corridor between I-605 and SR-73. The City strongly urges that the planning efforts for the Maglev and the MIS program be coordinated by the various planning agencies and that the City be kept informed during all stages of these important planning processes.</p> <p>7. SR-22/I-405 HOV Direct Connector- The list of projects defines the SR-22/I-405 project as "design HOV to HOV Lane Connectors" (Tier 2 ORA000193). Based upon discussion with SCAG staff, we understand the Draft 2004 RTP includes construction of this HOV connector in the modeling. In the Final 2004 RTP, please revise the language to clarify the project includes both design and construction.</p>	<p>entirety, including the California Nevada Maglev line as a study project. The map also includes future planned lines that are under study.</p> <p>6. SCAG agrees that planning for Maglev should be coordinated with other ongoing planning efforts in the same corridors.</p> <p>7. The SR-22/I-405 HOV Connector project (Tier 2 ORA000193) was incorrectly identified as "design" in the Draft RTP Appendix I. It was modeled as a fully constructed project and the description will be corrected in the Final RTP project listing.</p> <p>Response to Comments in Attachment A</p> <p>1. Comment duly noted. SCAG will make every effort to coordinate and keep all the stake holders informed of all future Maglev related activities.</p> <p>2. Comment noted. SCAG will continue to work cooperatively with the stakeholders relative to SCAG's growth visioning efforts.</p> <p>3. The planning and implementation of bus service is the responsibility of the local and regional transit providers. OCTA in their efforts to improve and enhance services in Orange County will be implementing a number of Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) lines. BRT is designed to provide fast and high quality bus service to major activity centers.</p> <p>4. Comment noted. Ground access improvements needed for Long Beach to accommodate 3.8 MAP will be included in the Final 2004 RTP. Site-specific plans, studies and environmental documents related to future expansion of the airport is the responsibility of the City of Long Beach.</p> <p>5. Comment duly noted.</p>
RTP-04-089	1/26/2004	Pennell, Margary		Please do not allow triple trailer trucks in our State, or LCVs in the truck only lanes proposed by the Regional Transportation Plan.	Comment noted.
RTP-04-090	1/26/2004	Gordon, Rita		We are not in favor of LCVs in California and add any new truck lanes.	Comment noted.
RTP-04-091	1/26/2004	Sewell, Ruth		Please -- no change in existing laws governing width, length and weight of vehicles traveling on all the California roads and highways. It is our safety at stake and all our children.	Comment noted.
RTP-04-092	1/27/2004	Sherwood, June		Please do not allow LCVs in the truck only lanes proposed by the Regional Transportation Plan. We feel this would be dangerous to car traffic.	Comment noted.

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
 (Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-093	1/27/2004	Rubio, Larry	Riverside Transit Agency	<p>1. Exe. Summary - Page 7, 3rd paragraph, Land Use Transit Coord., - Use the word "must" is appropriate because it refers generally to interagency collaborations, establishing relationships in the SCAG region and does not imply undue interference with local land use authority.</p> <p>2. TDM, pg. 75-78; although "bus" is mentioned as a TDM strategy, the bulleted sections that follow do not include any discussion for bus or rail that is comparable to text describing carpools, vanpools and other alternative modes to the SOV.</p> <p>3. Page 90, Table 4.9 "Corona Metrolink Station..." this should be corrected to read "Rapid Link 1A: UCR-Downtown Riverside - Corona No. Main Metrolink Station" as the first BRT corridor proposed in Western Riverside. Implementation: FY 05/06. Next line should be corrected to read: "RapidLink 2-B: Moreno Valley to Downtown Riverside as the second proposed corridor segment for Western Riverside. Implementation: FY 09/10.</p> <p>4. Page 91 under Land Use - RCTC committee objected to the words "must" in the 2nd paragraph when describing the role of local jurisdictions in land use-transit connection because it was felt that SCAG is dictating to the local jurisdictions. (see comment letter for suggested language).</p> <p>5. The "Other Recommendations" section that begins on pg. 95 should be moved to following Transit Centers on pg. 91, to give it proper focus and connectivity with the preceding discussion. Additionally, the word "other" from "other recommendations" should be dropped to simply read "Recommendations". These recommendations were important goals that were developed over the past 3 yrs by the SCAG Transit Task Force, but now appear watered down by the title and placement in the document.</p>	<p>1. Comment noted.</p> <p>2. Comment noted - the reference to bus is for context only; the detailed discussion of public transit (bus and rail) is found on pages 89-96.</p> <p>3. Comment noted. Corrections will be made to Table 4.9.</p> <p>4. The proposed final RTP has been edited as suggested in the comment.</p> <p>5. Comment noted. SCAG has moved the recommendations following page 91. The word other was used to differentiate these recommendations from the project specific investments.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-094	1/27/2004	McKeon, Howard P. "Buck"		Please to learn that the I-5 HOV and truck climbing lane projects, also known as the "I-5 Santa Clarita-Los Angeles Gateway Improvement Project" is part of the SCAG Goods Movement Project List. However, I hope to see the project moved to a higher priority and included in the RTP....The project will provide significant economic, environmental, safety and congestion mitigation benefits to North Los Angeles County. I would appreciate your assistance to move this critical project to a high priority in the 2004 RTP.	Comment noted. RTP is required by law to be financially constrained. What that means is that the plan must demonstrate reasonably that every project and program identified in the plan will have the necessary funding to implement them within the time horizon of the plan. As indicated in the Draft 2004 RTP, the county of Los Angeles has a deficit of over \$3 billion even to meet existing commitments without new funding initiatives identified in the plan. Even with the new funding initiatives, Los Angeles County has only \$12 billion. Additional half cent sales tax assumed for LA County accounts for a large share of this new funding, which comes with committed expenditure plan. That leaves the region with very little flexibility to add new projects in the constrained portion of the plan. However, the technical appendix of the plan does include a list of unconstrained projects. There is an unmet need of over \$80 billion in this region. Staff will include this project in this unconstrained list of projects. Should the funding scenario change in the next planning cycle, inclusion of the projects in the unconstrained list will ensure consideration of the projects for future funding.
RTP-04-095	1/27/2004	Goetz, Daniel M.	UltraViolet Devices, Inc.	Urges SCAG to include the I-5 Santa Clarita-Los Angeles Gateway Improvement Project in the RTP NOW.	See response to comment from Mr. McKeon above.
RTP-04-096	1/27/2004	Cacciotti, Michael A.	City Of South Pasadena	<p>1. Land Use - The City reviewed growth patterns at a SCAG workshop and made corrections on maps. The projected growth was deemed unreasonable due to the historical commercial and residential properties that exist in the station area.</p> <p>2. I-710 Gap Closure - The City of South Pasadena references the project as the "710 extension", as the use of the term "Gap Closure" implies that there some element of the 710 that is missing and needs to be built. The City strongly disagrees with this assertion and is committed to the solutions provided by the Multi-Modal Alternative: Low-Build Approach in the 710 Freeway Extension.</p> <p>3. The South Pasadena City Council took an action NOT TO OPPOSE the Tunnel Feasibility Study. The words "NOT OPPOSE" are not synonymous with "SUPPORT." Therefore, we would appreciate representatives from the MTA and SCAG to accurately reflect our neutral position in all written and oral communications.</p>	<p>1. The Draft RTP does not contain land use assumptions relative to projects at this level of specificity. The City of South Pasadena's workshop input will be considered for planning efforts beyond the scope of this RTP.</p> <p>Response to 2 through 10. 710 Gap Closure Need and Phasing SCAG has determined that the 710 Gap Closure represents a significant regional need. The 710 Gap Closure has been included in previous Regional Transportation Plans, including the 2001 RTP. Funding for the completion of the first phase of the 710 Gap Closure between Valley Blvd. and Huntington Drive has been included in the 2002 RTIP and this segment is considered a baseline project to be completed by 2010.</p> <p>710 Gap Closure (Tunnel) SCAG, Caltrans, and LACMTA have committed to assessing the feasibility of a tunnel option for completion of the 710 Gap Closure by 2025.</p> <p>710 Mitigation Projects SCAG supports the continued planning and programming of mitigation measures identified in the 1998 Record of Decision regarding the 710</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>4. The RTP should analyze the potential mobility and air quality benefits from less costly projects as opposed to the concentrating scarce resources on the 710 extension.</p> <p>5. The City suggests that the existing stubs on the freeway be removed and appropriate HOV connectors be constructed to provide alternative regional movement on the existing freeway system (see comment letter)</p> <p>6. Given California's budget crisis and the removal of the federal entitlement pending additional environmental analysis, the project should be withdrawn from the Plan as it cannot be built within the time frame of the RTP.</p> <p>7. In the 2004 RTP, HOV lanes for the Gap Closure are included, however HOV lanes are not included for the rest of the 710 nor are they recommended within the entire RTP. Building HOV lanes on a 6.2 mile section may meet the spirit of that principal (refers to Policy regarding HOV gap closures), but it appears mainly as an attempt to justify the high priority given to the project. (see comment letter)</p> <p>8. The SCAG model needs to consider assisting goods movement by innovative solutions including the initiation of large vehicle incident management.</p> <p>9. 710- phased programming effectively eliminates the possibility of the deep bore tunnel alternative which cannot be build in 15-yr segments. This inconsistency with the current SCAG tunnel feasibility efforts must be resolved before it is included in the 2004 RTP...If project funding cannot be programmed to accommodate this alternative, then the project should be dropped.</p> <p>10. The completion of the I-210 significantly increased traffic through the western San Gabriel Valley travel corridor. Before more freeway lanes are added, air quality impacts of the increased traffic</p>	<p>Gap Closure.</p> <p>710 Air Quality The projects included in the RTP go through extensive analysis, including impacts to air quality. SCAG is required to produce a plan, based upon this analysis, which meets requirements conforming to the NAAQS, which and demonstrates attainment.</p> <p>HOV Comments HOV projects and numerous HOV connectors are contained in the Draft RTP. HOV lanes capacity on the 710 corridor is consistent with the needs identified in analysis of the corridor.</p> <p>11. The RTP provides funding for grade separation projects as established through MTA's annual Call for Projects. Individual projects must be submitted through this process in order to receive funding.</p> <p>12. Comment noted.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>within the area should be analyzed. The RTP needs to analyze and propose mitigations for BASELINE projects before extending or implementing additional projects. Add'l project specific environmental impact analysis should be conducted before pursuing large-scale regional projects.</p> <p>11. The City requests that the grade separation project of Pasadena Ave./Monterey Road through South Pasadena be added to the RTP.</p> <p>12....take into consideration the impact from mobile source toxins that would be generated from an at-grade freeway extension (see comment letter)</p>	
RTP-04-097	1/27/2004	Rubio, Larry	Riverside Transit Agency	<p>1. page 75, 2nd paragraph mention "bus" as a TDM strategy but the sections that follow on Pgs 76-78 do not include any discussion for bus or rail that is comparable to text describing carpools, vanpools and other alternative modes to the SOV.</p> <p>2. Page 90, Table 4.9, request change in project descriptions (see comment letter)</p> <p>3. RCTC Committee objected to words "must" in the 2nd para. when describing role of local jurisdictions in land use-transit connection...felt that SCAG is dictating to the local jurisdictions. (see comment letter for language recommendations)</p> <p>4. The "Other Recommendations" section on page 95 should be moved to follow Transit Centers on pg 91 to give it proper focus and connectivity with the preceding discussion. Additionally, the word "other" should be dropped to simply read "recommendations". These recommendations were important goals developed over the past 3 yrs by the SCAG Transit Task Force and appear watered down by the title and placement in the document.</p>	<p>1. Comment noted. The reference will be deleted in the Final Plan document.</p> <p>2. Comment noted. Correction will be made to Table 4.9.</p> <p>3. The intent of the use of the word "must" is to emphasize the need for much stronger and more active role for transit agencies in the development review process. SCAG as the regional planning agency does not mandate or dictate policy to local jurisdictions. Appropriate revisions will be made to reflect the intention of the statement on page 91, as stated above.</p> <p>4. Comment noted. Appropriate changes will be incorporated.</p>
RTP-04-098	1/28/2004	Crain, Robert	City Of Blythe	<p>City is concerned that the RTP does not adequately address the current or future transportation needs of eastern Riverside County. Specifically requests that the following considerations be incorporated into the Plan:</p> <p>1. Under current conditions (i.e. no truck by-pass</p>	<p>Comments noted. The RTP identifies a number of arterial improvements in the City of Blythe as well as widening of I-10 in the Coachella Valley. However, it does not currently include widening of I-10 in Blythe or the Southeastern Bypass in the financially constrained plan. Should additional funding become available for these projects, they may be considered for inclusion in the future RTP updates.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
 (Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>route) the capacity expansion of Interstate Highway 10 via addition of a third travel lane (in each direction) or at a minimum, construction of truck passing lanes must be considered.</p> <p>2. The Southeastern Bypass Routing Study - Phase I Final Report dated June 30, 2003 prepared for SCAG by CVAG which identified specific benefits to the transportation system of western Riverside County via the diversion of truck traffic from Interstate Highway 10 was not, but should be, addressed in SCAG's plan.</p>	
RTP-04-099	1/28/2004	Tetu, Dennis	Little Rock Town Council	<p>Letter is to U.S. Representative Howard P. McKeon expressing concern with projects on Highway 138. One of the concern is the completion dates have been moved out two years to reflect state budgetary problems. The Little Rock Town Council urges its elected government officials to assist the various communities affected by these projects in helping secure the necessary federal/state partnership funds to complete these projects by their originally scheduled completion dates of 2007. Another concern is the widening project from 2 lanes to a four lane highway that will run through Little Rock. Town Council fears the street widening will destroy the small town character of the area and would be a significant deterrent to successful business operations throughout the city. The Town Council would suggest a 3-lane road from 77th to 89th with the center lane being used for left turns. This change of plans would be less costly, reduce the number of left turn accidents along this corridor, permit timelier funding, and help retain the desired rural atmosphere.</p>	Comment noted.

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-100	1/28/2004	Dahlerbruch, Anton, City of Beverly Hills Stephen C. Cunningham, City of Culver City Suzanne Frick, City of Santa Monica Joan English, City of West Hollywood	Westside Cities	<p>WESTSIDE CITIES:</p> <p>1. It is essential that the RTP support infill development by addressing the multi-modal transportation needs of the Westside Cities as identified in the Westside Mobility Study.</p> <p>2. Westside Cities is woefully undeserved by transit and the Draft RTP does little to address the urgency of the Westside Cities' transportation needs.</p> <p>3.the document has an over-emphasis on freeway and arterial improvement at the expense of Westside priorities such as transit development and non-motorized transportation.</p> <p>4...the RTP is contradictory; The plan advocates infill development, but does not acknowledge the urgency of the need for rapid transit to serve the infill.</p> <p>5. Even though Westside priorities are listed, it is difficult to know whether they are adequate due to the very limited information provided in the Draft RTP and Technical Appendices.</p> <p>6. Almost no information is provided on non-motorized transportation projects. Technical Appendices lists "countywide" transit and non-motorized transportation projects without any specific details. This omission send a message that non-motorized and multi-modal transportation options are not a regional priority.</p> <p>7. It is difficult to gain an understanding of total RTP effects due to the inconsistency in the way projects are listed.. Chapt 4 provides very little indication of type and size of Baseline and Tier 2 projects and the technical appendices provide no information on costs, partner agencies and subregional locations for these projects. (see comment letter)</p> <p>8. Performance indicators outlined in the RTP are outdated, inconsistent with stated objectives, and will perpetuate inappropriate road biases. (see comment letter)</p> <p>Growth Visioning:</p>	<p>1. Comment duly noted. Staff will review the Westside Mobility Study and consider appropriate incorporation in the final RTP.</p> <p>2. Comment duly noted. An RTP is legally required to be a financially constrained document. Our needs far exceed our means. Within the constraints of the available transportation funding, the Westside cities are treated no worse or better than other parts of the region.</p> <p>3. Comment duly noted.</p> <p>4. Comment duly noted. The plan includes addition of several new Bus Rapid Transit projects to the west side in addition to the completion of the Exposition Light Rail project. Within the constraints of the finances, the plan also proved for a significant commitments in non-motorized transportation.</p> <p>5. Comment noted. Staff will make every attempt to make all relevant and available project information in the final RTP and the associated technical appendices.</p> <p>6. Comment noted. The 2004 RTP provides the basic framework and flexibility for investment in the non-motorized transportation system. The Plan implicitly acknowledges that the development and implementation of such projects can be better achieved at the local level.</p> <p>7. Comment noted. The final RTP will aim to summarize main projects included in the Baseline and Tier 2 to clarify the point as per suggestion.</p> <p>8. The performance indicators are all multi modal and were developed in cooperation with a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) comprised of many stakeholder groups, including representatives from the Westside Cities. The delay indicator mentioned does cover arterials and freeways, both of which serve bus services. The comment is correct in terms of rail transit, which generally does not experience delay due to congestion.</p> <p>9. Adjustments to the forecasted growth for the Westside Cities sub-region have been made in response to this comment.</p> <p>10. The Draft RTP does not contain assumptions on development and projects at the suggested level of specificity. This comment is noted, and will be reflected in future planning efforts beyond the scope of this RTP.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
 (Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>9. Two sets of data pertaining to the Westside Cities are incorrect. (see comment letter)</p> <p>10. The development projects identified in the Growth Vision Map for the City of Culver City are inconsistent with Culver City's General Plan and Zoning Code. (Comment letter makes recommendations on where denser residential and mixed used development should be located)</p> <p>11. Population and household projections for the Santa Monica under the No Project and Preferred Plan scenarios are significantly greater than the City's Local Input projected provided in November 2002. (see comment letter)</p> <p>12. Population projections in West Hollywood under the Preferred Plan scenario are 3.4 times greater than the Local input projection, and are more than doubled under the No Project scenario. (see comment letter)</p> <p>13. The data sets upon which the RTP is based indicate that the Westside Cities bear a disproportionate burden of regional employment, housing, population and traffic congestion. We would appreciate if you could incorporate each of these issues in the final RTP and provide the Westside Cities with a response on each of the issues identified in this letter</p>	<p>11. Adjustments to the forecasted growth for the Westside Cities sub-region have been made in response to this comment. 12. Adjustments to the forecasted growth for the Westside Cities sub-region have been made in response to this comment.</p> <p>13. The comment is duly noted.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-101	1/29/2004	Bertoni, Vince	City Of Santa Clarita	<p>1. Growth Visioning Plan Alternative Projections - The City requests that CAG continue to consider both the quantitative data and qualitative information provided by the City so that regional distribution and transportation investments are in line with local infrastructure capacity and land use characteristics.</p> <p>2. SCV Transportation Improvements - The City urges the inclusion of HOV lanes on the I-5 from SR-14 to SR-126 in the 2004 RTP 2030 HOV System. The City also requests that SCAG include the RTP Truck Climbing lanes on the I-5 from the SR-14 to Calgrove Blvd.</p> <p>3. For Exhibit 4.1 and Table 4.4; Add one HOV lane in each direction from I-5/SR-14 to SR-126 on I-5, and include the I-5/SR-14 HOV Connector in the Baseline Network (also confirm that it is included in Table 4.5).</p> <p>4. Exhibit 4.2 and Table 4.6: Add one MF lane in each direction from I-5/SR-14 to Calgrove Blvd. (as the Truck Lane) on I-5.</p>	<p>1. An adjustment to the forecasted growth for the North Los Angeles sub-region has been made in response to this comment.</p> <p>2. The RTP is a financially constrained plan, and at this point the I-5 improvements you describe can not be funded with revenues that are expected during the RTP time frame. Therefore, the HOV and truck improvements to I-5 are included in the unconstrained portion of the Draft 2004 RTP. In the event that additional funds become available, these improvements may be considered for inclusion in the constrained portion of the plan in a future RTP update.</p> <p>3. Regarding I-5 HOV lanes, see response to Comment No.2 above. The I-5/SR-14 HOV connector is a Tier 2 project (not Baseline) because it had not received NEPA clearance by 2002. Tier 2 projects are listed separately in the Technical Appendix I, not in Table 4.5.</p> <p>4. Please see response to Comment No. 2 above.</p>
RTP-04-102	1/29/2004	Beauman, John	City Of Brea	<p>1) The City of Brea is "particularly interested in transit solutions that provide options for commuters who travel to and from the San Gabriel Valley/Inland Empire area to Orange Co via the SR-57 and SR 142 (Carbon Cyn Rd) corridors. A north-south connection to the east-west Metrolink lines in the San Gabriel Valley would address this need.</p> <p>2) The City of Brea supports SCAG's efforts, through the RTP, to assure that our region receives its fair share of both State and Federal funding for transportation solutions. The importance of securing state and federal funding to implement the RTP should continue to be emphasized within discussions and presentations of the RTP.</p> <p>3) The City of Brea supports the draft PEIR's program level review as appropriate for this regional plan. Further, detailed, impact analysis for individual transportation projects, as necessary, would more appropriately occur as components of plan implementation.</p>	<p>1) There are no plans by SCARRA for any new Metrolink service in the areas specified.</p> <p>2) Indeed, SCAG will continue to emphasize the importance of securing state and federal funding to implement RTP projects. Transportation funding will be of particular importance in the coming months in light of the recent State Budget proposal to divert transportation funds for general fund purposes and the current debate about funding levels for TEA-21 reauthorization.</p> <p>3) The City's support for detailed project-level analysis as part of plan implementation is noted.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-103	2/2/2004	Blum, Jerry	City Of Ontario	Figure 4.9 implies that the California Nevada Interstate Maglev Program (CNP) between Anaheim and Las Vegas is only "under study" and not necessarily moving forward. The City of Ontario believes this representation of the CNP grossly underestimates the potential for construction of the CNP within the RTP operational period. ... "the City of Ontario requests that the RTP be revised to accurately reflect the formal support for the CNP provided by the SCAG Regional Council by identifying the CNP in a similar fashion as the other Maglev lines within the RTP. Further, Ontario requests the CNP alignment be shown in accordance with current discussions as noted above (see comment letter)	The California Nevada Super Speed Train Commission's Maglev proposal will be included as a study in the RTP. SCAG has not been able to include this project as a construction project due to financial constraint standards set for the transportation plan by federal regulations.
RTP-04-104	2/2/2004	Negriff, Stephanie	Big Blue Bus	Bus Transit 1. Bus only lanes should be included in plans for Bus Rapid Transit enhancement and expansion, particularly at peak periods. 2. Signal priority should also be implemented for tier 2 and tier 3 transit services on streets not served by Bus Rapid Transit 3. Bus Rapid Transit on the Lincoln Blvd. Corridor connecting Santa Monica, Venice, Marina del Rey and Playa Vista with LAX, operating during peak periods on bus only lanes, should be identified for implementation by 2010. 4. The Green Line extension to LAX must be designed to facilitate transfers to and from bus transit routes serving the Westside. 5. The Exposition Line should be identified as being completed between downtown LA and Santa Monica by 2015.	1. Financial constraints does not allow for implementation of "bus-only" lanes for all the proposed BRT lines. 2. The current financial situation does not allow for implementing signal priority for tier 2 and 3 transit services. 3. Implementation of BRT on Lincoln Blvd. Corridor will be prior to 2010. However, the line will not be operating on bus-only lanes. 4. The Airport Authority and the LADOT as the responsible planning agencies for the area, will ensure that the planned and future transit services are integrated and coordinated. 5. The completion date will be corrected to 2011.
RTP-04-105	2/2/2004	Keller, Larry	Port of Los Angeles	1. Page 3: SCAG RTP statement reads..."the region is served by the 2nd and 3rd largest ports in the U.S." The POLA is the number one Port in the U.S. in respect to cargo value and volume and POLB is ranked number 2 in volume. Suggested revision.."The region is served by the two largest	1. Appropriate revisions will be reflected in the final RTP. 2A. Comment noted. 2B. This is a public policy option that is yet to be determined. 3. The eventual means of garnering revenue from commercial flows is

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
 (Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>cargo-handling ports in the United States, and combined, the third largest in the world."</p> <p>2A. (refers to pg. 96 of RTP) "State Highways, as publicly funded facilities, are for all vehicles. Any user fee proposal must consider the impact of a fee on the regional transportation system as well as the potential diversion of cargo from one port to another. Trucks already pay fees that passenger vehicles are not subject to for use of state highways.</p> <p>2B. "It is unclear if facilities with dedicated truck-toll corridors would allow truck use in mixed-use lanes."</p> <p>3. (refers to RTP pg. 101) "If such a fee is implemented, this container fee should be imposed nationwide."</p> <p>4. (Referring to Pg. 203 - Marine Ports)..."As stated in the California Marine Transportation System Infrastructure Needs Report, March 2003, these ports are seeking \$4 billion to meet transportation infrastructure needs." Suggested Revision: "The San Pedro Bay ports are seeking \$4 billion over the next 10 to 15 years for infrastructure improvement projects in and around the Port complex including increasing on-dock rail capacity."</p> <p>5. (referring to pg. 103, Inland Port Concept).."An Inland Port Concept Study should involve all stakeholders, including the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach."</p>	<p>as yet unknown, and whatever means determined would be the subject of national and state level policy debates.</p> <p>4. Appropriate revisions will be reflected in the final RTP.</p> <p>5. Consistent with past practice, the San Pedro Bay ports will be invited to participate in such studies and their cooperation, as always, would be greatly appreciated.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-106	2/2/2004	Lim, Joseph		<p>1. The land use scenario provided by "SCAG does not conform to the City's current goals and plans. However, with some alternations to the land use scenario, it may be feasible for the City (to) implement comparable development concepts in future plans."...problem is some existing transit infrastructure does not coincide with the hierarchical theory of more intense land uses around transit related corridors (i.e. Blueline)." ...the future transit routes, the existing transit infrastructure and the gaps bridging the two should be shown in conjunction with the regional growth vision."</p> <p>2. Although the SCAG Growth Vision Map does not necessarily reflect the current policies of the City, the next General Plan update will reflect many of the development concepts and types that are proposed in the Land Use Scenario."</p>	<p>1. Comment noted. SCAG would be pleased to work with the City of Compton to insure greater consistency in the future local and regional plan updates.</p> <p>2. Comment noted.</p>
RTP-04-107	2/2/2004	Mendez, Michael A.	City Of Norwalk	<p>Commenting on behalf of The I-5 Consortium Cities Joint Powers Authority.</p> <p>1. The JPA supports the RTP inclusion of the I-5 Corridor Improvement Project.</p> <p>2. It is critical that SCAG continue to support the more affordable 10-lane project configuration.</p> <p>3. I-5 improvements per the Preferred Alternative rank high in terms of the SCAG "guiding principals" for developing highway strategies.</p> <p>4. Implementation schedules do not indicate a high priority for the I-5, but rather reflect transportation resource constraints and MTA's placing a higher priority on transit improvements at the expense if highway improvements.</p> <p>5. By all measures of need, the I-5 CIP represents one of the highest highway improvements in LA county subregion and beyond.</p> <p>6. The Draft RTP reflects only \$209 million for the I-5 CIP. The I-5 CIP was programmed for \$487 million in Dec. 2002. Additionally, the Plan does not provide for</p>	<p>1-3. Comment noted.</p> <p>4. RTP is a financially constrained multi-modal plan that is developed through a comprehensive, collaborative and continuous process involving all of the key stakeholders including SCAG, county transportation commissions and Caltrans. The schedule and priority for this project was established through this collaborative process.</p> <p>5. Comment noted. SCAG does not disagree that this is one of the highest priority corridors in the region.</p> <p>6. The 2004 RTP is being developed in a constrained fiscal environment that does not allow for full commitment of this project without jeopardizing some other critical project in the region.</p> <p>7. Again, given that the RTP must be a financially constrained plan, there is little flexibility in terms of assuming funds that may or may not be available in the future.</p> <p>8. Comment noted.</p> <p>9. Comment noted.</p> <p>10. Based on the information contained in the RTIP submitted to SCAG by MTA, only a Draft EIR for this project existed in Dec. 2002. SCAG will move this project to Baseline from Tier 2 in the future RTP amendment</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>the total estimated cost of \$2.1 billion for the I-5 CIP (not including the I-5/I-710 freeway interchange).</p> <p>7. By omission or intent, the Draft RTP does not incorporate the I-5 in a funding strategy to implement improvements in a timely manner. (see comment letter)</p> <p>8. The Draft RTP reflects a delay in I-5 CIP improvement schedules which has some consequences (see comment letter)</p> <p>9. Continuing delays threatens the consensus developed for the I-5 Preferred Alternative among the I-5 corridor stakeholders and transportation and regional planning agencies.</p> <p>10. The draft RTP does not include the I-5 interim HOV project (SR-22 to I-605) in the baseline. This project had a federal environmental document certified prior to Dec. 2002 and was in the adopted 2001 RTIP.</p> <p>11. "I-5 Interchanges (Orange Co. to Rosemead Blvd.); Implementation Schedule 2025" is included in the Plan element of the Draft RTP. The significance of this improvement related to I-5 improvements in the Baseline and Tier 2 improvements requires clarification.</p> <p>12. I-5 arterial freeway interchanges are key elements of I-5 CIP mixed flow and HOV improvements and must be constructed prior to or simultaneously with such improvements.</p> <p>Changes Needed to the Draft RTP:</p> <p>13. Re-evaluate the I-5 Corridor Improvement Project and reassess its priority based upon features and issues described in comments above.</p> <p>14. Designate the I-5 freeway as the highest-priority highway project in LA County.</p>	<p>upon verification of existing certified EIR.</p> <p>11. Based on your comment and coordination with the county commission, the implementation date for this interchange improvement has been revised to 2015 in the final 2004 RTP.</p> <p>12. Comment noted.</p> <p>13. Comment noted. RTP must be updated every three years or when a significant assumption in the plan is no longer valid. SCAG will continue to work with the stakeholders beyond the plan adoption to further evaluate the project for potential full funding commitments in the future updates as the funding situation changes.</p> <p>14. Comment noted. While RTP is not required to prioritize corridor improvements, SCAG considers I-5 as one of the most high priority corridors in the region.</p> <p>15. Comment noted. See response to no. 13 above.</p> <p>16. Comment noted.</p> <p>17. See response to no. 10 above.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>15. Reflect full funding for the I-5 CIP by developing a funding strategy that incrementally commits funds to I-5 improvements.</p> <p>16. Restrict I-5 improvements to no more than 10 lanes in order to contain project costs.</p> <p>17. Restore the environmentally cleared I-5 Interim HOV improvement project as a baseline project within the RTP and fully fund its immediate construction.</p>	
RTP-04-108	2/3/2004	Leahy, Arthur T.	Orange County Transportation Authority	<p>"We found the Plan to be well written and SCAG's staff and consultant's cooperative during the preparation and review the Draft 2004 RTP."</p> <p>1. Growth Assumptions OCTA appreciates SCAG staff's willingness to work with OCTA, Orange Co. COG and the Center for Demographic Research to ensure that the growth assumptions for Orange County's population, households and employment in the Plan are consistent with the locally approved growth forecasts.</p> <p>2. Land Use Policies OCTA does not agree with the proposed regional role in linking land use and transportation projects/funding, as described in the following comment: "Align evaluation of projects within the RTP and the tenets of the Growth Vision as a method of funding decisions>" (pg. 151) OCTC recommends removing the proposed language from the document, or rewording it to clearly state support for land use and transportation linkages at the local level.</p> <p>3. Financial Assumptions OCTA and SCAG revenue forecasts for the Draft RTP specific to Orange Co. are not the same. Orange Co.'s projected revenues between 2002 and 2030 period are approx. \$758 billion greater than SCAG's projected revenues. Based upon discussion with SCAG staff, OCTA understands that differences in underlying assumptions is the reason for the differences....Since the Draft RTP includes all</p>	<p>1. SCAG has continued consultation with various agencies noted in the comment.</p> <p>2. The citation noted relates to future implementation measures beyond the adoption of this RTP. The proposed final RTP has been edited in response to the comment to specify consideration of Growth Visioning principles rather than "alignment."</p> <p>3. OCTA's comment with respect to the financial plan discrepancies has been noted.</p> <p>4. Comment duly noted. References to Joint Powers Authorities (JPA) are included as potential organizational mechanisms to implement some of the mega projects that cut across multiple jurisdictions and would require some type of user fees to construct, operate and maintain the systems. The final RTP implicitly acknowledges that further planning, organizational development and legal framework would be necessary prior to the formation of such JPAs.</p> <p>5. The Maglev system is planned to connect to most of the region's airports and other transportation and activity centers as described in Exhibit 4.9. This exhibit describes the currently proposed Maglev system in its entirety, including the California Nevada Maglev line as a study project. The map also includes future planned lines that are under study.</p> <p>6. Specific project responses: a) The study will be included in the final RTP. b) The description for the 22/405 HOV connector will be corrected in the final RTP to indicate construction.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
 (Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>of Orange County's transportation project nominations, OCTA acknowledges the projected revenue variances without prejudice against the plan.</p> <p>4. Regional Planning/Coordinating Agencies The DRTP includes multiple references to Joint Powers Authority type agencies for the implementation of various projects. The Final RTP should clarify these as conceptual, and acknowledge that further planning and organizational structures would have to be developed when the timing is appropriate.</p> <p>5. High Speed Rail/Maglev Figure 4.9 should include all proposed state and regional projects in addition to SCAG's planned system to provide the reader with the regional context of multiple ongoing planning efforts. The Cal-Nevada High Speed Rail Commission has an adopted alignment that Fig. 4.9 should show in the Final 2004 RTP.</p> <p>6. Specific Projects a) OCTA requests that the Final RTP include a long-range planning study for the I-5 South Corridor. OCTA did not include this study in its original list of project nominations, but the OCTA Board has identified it as a priority. b) Garden Grove FWY (SR 22/I405). Based upon discussion with SCAG staff, the DRTP includes construction of this HOV connector in the transportation demand modeling. In the final RTP, please revise the language to clarify the project includes both design and construction.</p>	
RTP-04-109	2/3/2004	Worden-Roberts, Connie	SCV TMA	"urge the advancement of the Interstate 5 Santa Clarita-Los Angeles Gateway Improvement Project. The Transportation Committee strongly recommend the project be advanced o the 2004 RTP."	This project is included in the RTP as an unconstrained project.

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-110	2/3/2004	Alexander, Bill	SANBAG	<p>1. Transportation Finance</p> <p>a) Concurs with the need to augment existing transp. funding sources through the strategies identified by SCAG.</p> <p>b) Questions the omission of increased truck fees, with a particular focus on truck weight, weight per axle and VMT, in light of the disproportionate impacts of trucks on our transportation system.</p> <p>c) Notes that SHOPP funding should be the source of nearly all the \$1.6 billion in added system preservation funding, and notes that such funding should be taken "off the top" rather than as part of a county share.</p> <p>d) Concerned that "color of money" issues have been inadequately addressed in the DRTP and is committed to working with SCAG to resolve them for the final RTP.</p> <p>e) Questions whether both public costs and private costs, as well as the benefits from each, included in the benefit/cost analysis.</p> <p>f) Suggests that in future RTPs, the transportation strategy should provide the basis for development of the financing strategy, so that the benefits of the Plan could help justify additional revenues. Instead, the DRTP fiscal strategy was developed independently and the transportation program was tailored to fit it.</p> <p>2. Projects</p> <p>a) SCAG-initiated projects such as dedicated truck lanes and Maglev need to be evaluated through the Regionally Significant Transportation Investment Study process in the same manner as projects sponsored by the transportation agencies or Caltrans.</p> <p>b) SCAG must clarify which projects are in the fiscally constrained Plan and provide add'l opportunity for discussion with project sponsors once</p>	<p>1. Transportation Finance</p> <p>a) SCAG will continue to work with SANBAG to ensure the timely implementation of the financial strategies outlined. Certainly, there are great challenges associated with each of the strategies identified. Accordingly, a coordinated regional effort to address long term funding issues is necessary.</p> <p>b) The financial strategies were developed under the guidance of the Highway and Transportation Finance Task Force. Throughout the development of the Draft 2004 RTP, various funding options were reviewed by the Task Force including truck weight and VMT strategies. These strategies will continue to be reviewed and further assessed for potential application.</p> <p>c) It is correct to assume that SHOPP funding would be taken "off the top" for added system preservation needs if the additional gas tax revenues were to be state imposed. However, SCAG's revenue strategy also includes an alternative means for collecting increased gasoline revenues, namely the imposition of a regional gas tax.</p> <p>d) SCAG has made every effort to ensure that appropriate funds are used for designated purposes in the Draft 2004 RTP. Nevertheless, SCAG welcomes further guidance by SANBAG as may be necessary to resolve any discrepancies.</p> <p>e) The benefit/cost analysis is considered from the perspective of the public provider and taxpayer. Accordingly, only public costs were accounted for in the analysis. Nevertheless, the benefits measured result from both public and private investments, recognizing that although taxpayers are not paying for a part of the system (the privately financed portion), they still benefit in total with respect to air quality improvements, delay savings, safety, etc.</p> <p>f) SCAG's development of the financial plan for the Draft 2004 RTP included extensive coordination with the general development of the transportation strategy. SCAG recognizes that these two efforts cannot be independent of each other.</p> <p>2. Projects</p> <p>a) Comment noted.</p> <p>b) All of the projects in the fiscally constrained plan are delineated in Technical Appendix I to the RTP.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>that info is available.</p> <p>c) SCAG needs to clarify whether 2004 RTIP projects are considered in Tier 2.</p> <p>d) SANBAG has identified several significant intercounty project delivery schedule inconsistencies that must be resolved, such as I-215S and SR-71 between Riverside and San Berdo. counties.</p> <p>e) Project implementation schedules should be refined to avoid the perception that most Plan projects would be delivered in 2030. Five-year increments may be more appropriate.</p> <p>f) Given the complexity of RTP development and the need to maintain consistency with the RTIP, SANBAG suggests that SCAG advocate revisions to planning requirements such that future RTPs could be developed on a four year cycle.</p> <p>3. Freight Movement –</p> <p>a) Believes that a multi-county effort is needed to gain an understanding of the potential benefits and costs of strategies to optimize system performance and minimize impacts by shifts among modes.</p> <p>b) a process to establish institutional arrangements capable of development and delivery of regional mega-projects should be defined and initiated at the earliest possible time.</p> <p>c) SANBAG suggests that the RTP should build on the Eastern Gateway concept to define a strategy and timetable to move this initiative forward.</p> <p>d) Concurs with the geographic extent of the mainline rail capacity initiative and Alameda Corridor East as shown.</p> <p>e) the potential impact of short-haul rail in association with inland ports should also be considered, and an institutional arrangement should be considered to</p>	<p>c) By definition, Tier 2 projects do not include 2004 RTIP projects unless these projects were programmed in 2002. Refer to Technical Appendix I.</p> <p>d) SCAG will continue to work with the funding and implementing agencies to resolve scheduling issues of inter-county projects.</p> <p>e) Comment noted.</p> <p>f) Comment noted.</p> <p>3. Freight Movement</p> <p>a) SANBAG has been party to several SCAG study initiatives designed to gauge system performance and modal issues.</p> <p>b) such institutional framework ideas have been shared with SANBAG staff which have subsequently been replicated in documents generated by SANBAG.</p> <p>c) please see East-West Corridor information in RTP.</p> <p>d) the concepts of an inland port are identified as a priority for further study.</p> <p>e) Comment noted.</p> <p>4. TDM</p> <p>a) The requested change is reflected in the 2004 RTIP.</p> <p>b) These investments are identified by each county transportation commission and provided to SCAG as funding available to address Trip Reduction and TDM goals/programs/strategies. Average annual investment amounts are negotiated and/or revised upon request by ctc's to SCAG for the appropriate RTIP cycle.</p> <p>c) A "menu" approach included in the RTP that is inclusive provides greater flexibility to all local programming entities and the RTIP allows choice of specific investment opportunities suited best to each county area.</p> <p>d) Comment noted.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>move this agency if analysis shows it to be a preferred component of the regional freight management strategy.</p> <p>4. TDM</p> <p>a) Recommends that all backup material identify annual "average" investments, and not "yearly" investments.</p> <p>b) SANBAG is unable to correlate proposed investments to goals/targets; and suggests that the investments do not seem to be equitable by county based on population or any other criterion.</p> <p>c) The DRTP should define separate TDM strategies so that funding, goals and delivery are specified throughout.</p> <p>d) Transit should not be referenced in this section, as it is referenced elsewhere in the DRTP.</p> <p>e) the ITS component is confusing, as there is another ITS component in the DRTP (pg. 72). Suggests that it would be more appropriate to remove references to ITS in this section and limit discussion to "traveler info."</p> <p>f) Clarify that TDM is dependent entirely on personal choices.</p> <p>g) Clarify that both public and private entities fund and play a role in TDM and identify all those partners.</p> <p>h) Funding identified in Table 4.3 has no relationship to goals set.</p> <p>i) The target of 8,000 new carpools and 5,000 new vanpools cannot be tracked/verified. Questions how SCAG intends to report or otherwise document progress toward these goals. How does SCAG proposed to differentiate between "new" arrangements existing ones? How is current</p>	<p>e) Comment noted.</p> <p>f) RTP Appendix D-2 addresses this comment.</p> <p>g) These investments are identified by each county transportation commission and provided to SCAG as funding available to address Trip Reduction and TDM goals/programs/strategies.</p> <p>h) The RTP specifies appropriate regional (six counties) TDM goals for ridesharing (carpools and vanpools), and telework/telecommute and work-at-home. Through the Association's Overall Work Program subregional planning efforts, SCAG can work with each county to identify appropriate rideshare tracking and documentation methods.</p> <p>i) Through the Association's Overall Work Program subregional planning efforts, SCAG can work with each county to identify appropriate rideshare tracking and documentation methods.</p> <p>j) Through the Association's Overall Work Program subregional planning efforts, SCAG can work with each county to identify appropriate rideshare tracking and documentation methods.</p> <p>k) Air Quality Management District rules and regulations are properly the subject of the respective air basin's air quality management plan.</p> <p>l) Air Quality Management District rules and regulations are properly the subject of the respective air basin's air quality management plan.</p> <p>m) Through the Association's Overall Work Program subregional planning efforts, SCAG can work with each county to identify appropriate telecommuting/telework/work-at-home promotion and tracking and documentation methods.</p> <p>n) Through the Association's Overall Work Program subregional planning efforts, SCAG can work with each county to identify appropriate telecommuting/telework/work-at-home promotion and tracking and documentation methods.</p> <p>o) Through the Association's Overall Work Program subregional planning efforts, SCAG will work with each county to identify appropriate discretionary (non-work) trip tracking and documentation methods.</p> <p>p) Comment noted- SCAG understands SANBAG does not fund telecommute/telework/work-at-home alternatives as commuting</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>documentation provided by CTCs included in SCAG's tracking/monitoring effort?</p> <p>j) The DRTP fails to note that many carpool and vanpool arrangements occur informally, without employer or CTC assistance. How are these arrangements documented and differentiated from others?</p> <p>k) The importance of Rule 2202 in the South Coast Air Basin should be discussed in the DRTP. Any changes to this Rule would have a major impact on goals and funding as well as the ultimate outcome.</p> <p>l) Ventura's Rule 210 and existing local ordinances should also be discussed.</p> <p>m) The telecommuting section of the DRTP should be changed to state that employers, not the CTCs fund and organize many of these programs. Further the CTCs do not track this progress.</p> <p>n) Questions how will SCAG monitor or track the progress of telecommuting.</p> <p>o) It should be clarified that CTCs do not provide programs for reducing discretionary trips. Please clarify how those trips are different than those addressed by the stated goals, and how are they tracked or monitored?</p> <p>p) SANBAG recommends the following changes to Table 4.3 (in today's \$):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Change title to "TDM Investments" Non-motorized: \$39 million - includes Article 3 and TEA funding. - Rideshare: \$36 million - includes staff, outreach, incentives, reward programs, regional ride matching. - Traveler Information: No CTC investment, so should be determined by SCAG and identify implementing agencies. - ITS: remove from this section - Park n Ride : \$6.5 million- assume 1 PNR lot is built every 4 years. - Telecommute: \$0 public investment - if a private 	<p>alternatives, excepting marketing efforts.</p> <p>5. Aviation</p> <p>a) Comment noted</p> <p>b) Comment noted</p> <p>c) The 170 MAP forecast represents a 4.2% average annual passenger increase from 2003 levels. In comparison, the FAA forecasts a 3.6% passenger increase for U.S. flag carriers in the 2003-2014 time period. The SCAG forecast is somewhat higher for the following reasons: (1) The Preferred Aviation Plan, in its decentralization of long-haul and international service from LAX to Ontario, Palmdale and March Inland Port airports, will create a significant amount of "induced" demand by placing that service closer to populations in fast growing areas. It will also create a significant amount of "catalytic" demand that is created in when businesses are attracted to locate around expanding airports that have developable land around them. (2) Maglev itself will also create additional "induced" demand by virtue of increasing the speed and predictability of the airport access trip for many air passengers. (3) The region's position on the Pacific Rim is expected to capture increasing international travel to and from rapidly developing countries in Asia, particularly China. (4) Lastly, the forecast horizon of the plan to 2030 will capture the retirement of the large baby boomer segment of the population, and retirees travel at greater than average rates.</p> <p>6. Maglev</p> <p>a) The aviation plan is a major part of Maglev's feasibility in the region. Thus, the Maglev Deployment program would be highly sensitive to aviation demand.</p> <p>b) The California Nevada Super Speed Train Commission's Maglev proposal will be included as a study in the RTP. SCAG has not been able to include this project as a construction project due to financial constraint standards set for the transportation plan by federal regulations.</p> <p>c) Four independent feasibility studies were conducted on the Southern California Maglev system. The feasibility studies for the four corridors demonstrate that the Maglev system can be constructed through a public-private partnership structure administered through a public agency, a joint powers authority (JPA), or a public non-profit (PNP)</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>investment dollar figure is identified, clarify that this is a private sector investment.</p> <p>5. Aviation</p> <p>a) Continues to support the regional distributed aviation strategy as shown in the DRTP.</p> <p>b) Believes that substantial add'l support for ground access improvements in the vicinities of the former Inland bases if they will exceed the activity levels experiences at Ontario International today.</p> <p>c) Questions whether the aviation demand forecast – from 77 MAP today to 170 MAP in 2030- is supported by the latest estimates of regional growth and socioeconomic outlook.</p> <p>6. Maglev</p> <p>a) What is the sensitivity of MAGLEV feasibility to variations in aviation demand?</p> <p>b) Believes that the fiscal constraint used as a basis to exclude the Anaheim/Ontario/High Desert MAGLEV line from the DRTP to date is inadequate in that the fiscal envelop is subject to modification if arranted by the merits of this or any other project. The determination to include or exclude the project should be based on a more substantial understanding of its merits than has been provided thus far.</p> <p>c) Believes that these and other questions will be best answered by preparation of investment-grade feasibility analyses, and questions when such info. Will be made available (no schedule of pre-deployment milestones is provided)</p> <p>d) Suggests that the RTP should contain discussion of high speed fixed guideway alternatives to MAGLEV and clarification of reasons why, in light of other high speed rail initiatives in Calif. it is the only technology under consideration by SCAG.</p>	<p>format using a number of innovative and traditional funding mechanisms. Nonetheless, evaluations of each segment are ongoing. Phase 1, including feasibility studies and pre-deployment analysis for the Initial Operating Segment from Ontario Airport to West Los Angeles was completed in December, 2003. Additional analysis will be undertaken through Phase 2 with preliminary engineering and EIR/EIS documentation.</p> <p>d) During the initiation of Maglev, analysis was conducted on all alternatives to Maglev technology. SCAG, the FRA and other agencies conducted analysis to determine the costs and benefits of all technologies. Each analysis for the Southern California region concluded that Maglev provided the most feasible solution.</p> <p>7. Land Use/Transportation/Growth Visioning</p> <p>a) SCAG remains committed to a cooperative approach with local governments on growth issues, and intends to continue the COMPASS/Growth Visioning effort beyond this RTP. Comment is duly noted.</p> <p>b) SCAG is continuously in dialogue with applicable agencies as suggested. Comment is duly noted.</p> <p>8. Environmental Quality</p> <p>SCAG is working actively with local, regional and State agencies to push for efforts to resolve the size of the "black box"--the amount of emission reductions needed for regional attainment of the national standards for which technologies and sources have not yet been identified. Although the region has made remarkable strides in cleaning up the air, all stakeholders realize that further progress will be significantly harder--if only because most of the easy and less painful steps have already been taken. SCAG will need the active support of its membership over the next few years, in particular, to bring the region into attainment of the State and National Ambient Air Quality Standards.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>7. Land Use/Transportation/Growth Visioning</p> <p>a) Believes that substantial local government support for this aspect of the DRTP must be developed prior to scheduled RTP adoption. This will require SCAG to emphasize the process of informing local governments of the benefits of the COMPASS strategy, making detailed land use and socioeconomic data readily available for local review, and development of an improved understanding of implementation issues and schedules.</p> <p>b) Suggests that SCAG initiate dialogue with the federal agencies to clarify or negotiate criteria for RTP approval.</p> <p>8. Environmental Quality</p> <p>SANBAG questions the reasonableness of a public agency that attaches multimillion dollar liability to regional and local governments responsible for 5% of the clear air strategy, while 70% of the strategy within the purview of state and federal agencies remains undefined without any apparent consequences to those responsible agencies. SANBAG suggests that SCAG take leadership, with the air districts, to advocate recrafting of conformity regulations to establish appropriately targeted and measured penalties for failure to meet conformity requirements. Such an effort is likely to be critical as preparation of the 2007 RTP begins.</p>	
RTP-04-111	2/3/2004	Pilarski, Stella	"I DO" Parties Wedding & Event Consultant	"The Golden State Gateway Coalition is pleased that the I-5 HOV and truck climbing lane project, also known as the I-5 Santa Clarita-Los Angeles Gateway Improvement Project, is part of the SCAG Goods Movement Project List. We would like (to) see the project advanced to the 2004 RTP."	
RTP-04-112	2/3/2004	Karnette, Betty	State Of California	"Calif. legislature passed Senate Joint Resolution 7 which expressed the position of the legislature that current federal truck size and weight limitations should be maintained and further strictly states the proposals to operate longer and heavier trucks on Calif. road should be rejected. In light of this resolution, we are writing to express our concern with	Comment noted.

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>the possibility that in its RTP, SCAG may suggest the use of longer combination vehicles (LCVs) on dedicated truck lanes. As you know, a May 23 SCAG briefing paper looks favorably upon LCV use on SR-60, as studied by the Reasons Foundation and SCAG itself....</p> <p>"in addition, I believe that the use of LCVs directly contradicts at least one of the goals listed on page 82 of the RTP that specifically states that the "Highway and Finance Task Force adopted a set of guiding principles in developing the highway improvement strategies," including the prioritization of "projects that enhance safety and security." It is my position that LCVs present more of a threat, rather than an enhancement, to safety and security." ...I would like to know whether SCAG is still contemplating the possibility of changing state, federal law to allow LCVs to operate along dedicated truck lanes in southern California. It would be entirely inappropriate to avoid mentioning the issue of LCVs in your draft RTP if that remains part of the overall concept."</p>	
RTP-04-113	2/3/2004	Bartlett, Thomas M.	City Of Santa Paula	<p>1. The Land Use Scenario Map should be revised to accurately include the City of Santa Paula's General Plan Growth Scenario 2020 (map attached).</p> <p>2. Compass population estimate for Santa Paula is too low.</p> <p>3. The city could add 3,600 dwelling units, please include this in the Growth Vision.</p> <p>4. The land use scenario does not align with the long term plans of the City of Santa Paula.</p> <p>5. The hierarchy of mixed use centers on the map is too small to read.</p> <p>6. What assumptions were used to account for projected increases among SCAG sub-areas?</p> <p>7. Consider including a table that shows the distribution of projected increases among jurisdictions within each sub area.</p>	<p>1. The Draft RTP does not contain assumptions on development and projects at the suggested level of specificity. This comment is noted, and will be reflected in future planning efforts beyond the scope of this RTP.</p> <p>2. An adjustment to the forecasted growth for the Ventura County sub-region has been made in response to this comment.</p> <p>3. An adjustment to the forecasted growth for the Ventura County sub-region has been made in response to this comment.</p> <p>4. Comment is duly noted, and adjustments in the Draft RTP have been made.</p> <p>5. The Draft RTP does not contain assumptions on development and projects at the suggested level of specificity. This comment is noted, and will be reflected in future planning efforts beyond the scope of this RTP.</p> <p>6. SCAG's Subregion forecasts are determined by historical trends, share of historical growth, and information obtained from local input process. . For detail process and methodology, please see the 2004 RTP Technical Appendix A Growth Forecast.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
					7. Comment is duly noted. The proposed final RTP will contain growth forecasted at the sub-region level.
RTP-04-114	2/3/2004	Alvord, Mary J.	City Of Burbank	<p>1a. Aviation - "...the City continues to disagree with the premise that the existing Burbank Airport facility has a capacity of 9.4 MAP, and with the 2004 RTP assumption that it could be increased to 10.7 MAP by developing three new remote aircraft parking positions. Neither the terminal facilities nor the ground access system has the capacity to accommodate a doubling of the existing 4.7 MAP. (see comment letter)</p> <p>1b. In the absence of any improvements being identified in the RTP to mitigate the traffic impacts of a 10.7 MAP, the City requests that (1) an analysis be done to demonstrate how acceptable levels of service can be maintained on arterials and other City streets with the added traffic volumes, (2) funding be programmed to pay for the necessary improvements, and (3) necessary right-of-way acquisitions and corridors be identified to guide decision-makers."</p> <p>1c. "The City requests that the responsibilities and powers of the proposed Consortium be fully detailed in the RTP, and that it not have the explicit or even implicit authority to impose airport decisions on individual facilities or the jurisdictions in which they are located in a manner inconsistent with established state law and local ordinances."</p> <p>2. Maglev - "Unless the high speed rail system is in place to provide a quick and reliable alternative to driving on clogged freeways, urban area passengers will continue to choose the airport that is most</p>	<p>1a. A detailed capacity analysis conducted by SCAG for the 2004 RTP has determined that the existing terminal and airfield facilities at Bob Hope Airport can accommodate 10.7 MAP with the addition of three remote parking positions. It is recognized that this is an absolute capacity limitation that could not be accommodated without the three remote parking positions, or without a high level of congestion in the existing terminal facility that would need to be mitigated. With LAX constrained to 78 MAP, and with the elimination of El Toro in the 2004 RTP, a very high level of aviation demand is forecast to be placed on Bob Hope Airport from its local service area in 2030 due to a lack of convenient airport alternatives. Please see response to comment from Mr. Dios Marrero's of Burbank-Glendale Airport.</p> <p>1b. An airport ground access element will be included in the Final 2004 RTP, which will show critically needed ground access improvements and associated costs in the Bob Hope Airport service area needed to accommodate 10.7 MAP at the airport.</p> <p>1c. The airport consortium as current envisioned would be a forum for airports to coordinate their planning activities within the parameters established by the adopted regional aviation plan. It is not currently envisioned to have any preemptive powers over individual airports. Prior to the adoption of the 2004 RTP, it is premature to specify the exact responsibilities and powers that the airport consortium would have. These will be specified in more detail through SCAG's continuing planning process over the next year, in the development of a Regional Aviation Implementation Plan.</p> <p>2. SCAG looks forward to continuing to work with the City of Burbank on the deployment of Maglev in the Southern California region.</p> <p>3. The 2004 RTP supports the concept of linking the region's major activity centers through the development of a flexible transit system. The</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>conveniently located and accessible to them....the City is prepared to discuss the feasibility of developing any transportation system that has the potential to alleviate congestion and better distribute air passenger demand."</p> <p>3. Public Transportation - "We must continue to develop dedicated transitways between existing transportation nodes to create a comprehensive public transportation network that will provide a viable alternative to automobile travel. One such project could be a continuation of the Gold Line westward along SR-134 and I-5 freeways to connect to the Burbank Airport."</p> <p>4. Funding Plan - "Regardless of the historical justification for raising the gas tax rate, and the past support for transportation sales taxes, relying on generating political support for these two strategies to fund a \$31 billion need does not comprise a feasible strategic program."for SCAG to correctly include Local Funds (Prop A and C, TDA, and gas taxes) as part of the Regional revenues, all of the local transit and roadway improvements funded by these programs would necessarily need to be included as "Regional" needs. If the local needs are not included, and there is no reduction or diversion of local funding, the Regional funding need is understated. While the City is supportive of regional planning and solutions to traffic and transportation issues, local funding needs to continue to be available to cities to address local needs."</p>	<p>Plan strongly recommends the establishment of a network of transit-based centers and corridors.</p> <p>4. SCAG recognizes the challenges associated with the proposed revenue initiatives outlined in the RTP. Nevertheless, given the timeframe of the RTP (horizon year of 2030), it would be unreasonable to assume no new taxes or no increases in existing taxes to support our growing transportation needs. Certainly, the debate about the need to increase the gas tax, both at the state and federal level, continues. Accordingly, the 2004 RTP reflects historical and current trends. Additionally, Local funds as noted in the RTP refers to locally generated funding that supports regionally significant projects.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-115	2/3/2004	Art Brown	LOSSAN Rail Corridor Agency	<p>1. Intercity passenger rail enhances the region's ability to move people on the system.</p> <p>2. Intercity passenger rail provides access to unique funding sources.</p> <p>3. Recommend incorporating ITS related rail projects such as passenger information systems, GPS technology and automated vehicle locating systems, and seamless ticketing systems.</p> <p>4. LOSSAN plans to continue to advocate for rail improvements.</p> <p>5. The Pacific Sunliner Corridor is the fastest growing in the US.</p> <p>6. Amtrak riders represent 1.25 million vehicles taken off roadways each year.</p> <p>7. Consider a reference to LOSSAN Strategic Plan regarding Union Station improvements.</p> <p>8. Page 47. Table 2.2. What is meant by heavy rail?</p> <p>9. Consider changing "commuter rail facilities" to "passenger/commuter rail facilities" under the SCRIFA discussion.</p> <p>10. Exhibit 4.8 does not show the Fullerton-Los Angeles corridor.</p>	<p>1. Comment noted.</p> <p>2. Comment noted.</p> <p>3. Comment noted.</p> <p>4. Comment noted.</p> <p>5. Comment noted.</p> <p>6. Comment noted.</p> <p>7. Comment noted.</p> <p>8. Heavy rail is referred to the Metro Red Line.</p> <p>9. Comment noted.</p> <p>10. Exhibit 4.8 illustrates grade separation projects. It does not include addition of tracks.</p>
RTP-04-116	2/4/2004	Name, No	Californians for Safe Highways	Supports dedicated truck lanes. Is concerned that because truck lanes are voluntary, SCAG would allow the use of heavier and longer trucks including LCV's to try and entice truck operators to use the dedicated routes.	Comment noted. RTP recognizes that The decision to allow LCVs and other longer trucks will require additional study, outreach, and consensus building.
RTP-04-117	2/4/2004	Moorehead, Debbie		Please add I-5 Truck Lanes over the Newhall Pass to the 2004 RTP.	Comment noted. RTP is required by law to be financially constrained. What that means is that the plan must demonstrate reasonably that every project and program identified in the plan will have the necessary funding to implement them within the time horizon of the plan. As indicated in the Draft 2004 RTP, the county of Los Angeles has a deficit of over \$3 billion even to meet existing commitments without new funding initiatives identified in the plan. Even with the new funding initiatives, Los Angeles County has only \$12 billion. Additional half cent

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
					sales tax assumed for LA County accounts for a large share of this new funding, which comes with committed expenditure plan. That leaves the region with very little flexibility to add new projects in the constrained portion of the plan. However, the technical appendix of the plan does include a list of unconstrained projects. There is an unmet need of over \$80 billion in this region. Staff will include this project in this unconstrained list of projects. Should the funding scenario change in the next planning cycle, inclusion of the projects in the unconstrained list will ensure consideration of the projects for future funding.
RTP-04-118	2/4/2004	West, Frank	City Of Moreno Valley	<p>1. RTP should encourage greater ridership on existing rail lines.</p> <p>2. Cannot support legislative action for higher density development.</p> <p>3. Figure 4.4 SR60 is mislabeled as I10. Also, misidentified the location of future employment and population centers in Moreno Valley.</p> <p>4. Moreno Valley to San Bernardino CETAP corridor should be included on Exhibit 4.2.</p> <p>5. Page 95. Do not support changes to CEQA regarding mode split.</p> <p>6. Growth Vision is infeasible, inconsistent with existing and proposed Moreno Valley land uses.</p>	<p>1. Comment duly noted.</p> <p>2. Comment duly noted. The RTP does not call for support of specific legislation on development issues, but does call for further exploration.</p> <p>3. Comment duly noted. Appropriate corrections will be made in the final RTP.</p> <p>4. The Moreno Valley to San Bernardino County CETAP Corridor is identified as a potential toll corridor. Once the corridor study is completed, the final alignment and project details will be included in a future RTP update. Depending on the outcome of the study, and should additional funding become available, this corridor may also be advanced as a mixed flow project in a future RTP update.</p> <p>5. As per comment 2, the RTP does not call for support of specific legislation on development issues, but does call for further exploration.</p> <p>6. The comment is noted. The RTP does not call for specific local action at this time, but rather a continued dialogue between SCAG and local governments on potential actions that promote mutual benefit. SCAG cannot supercede local land use authority in any way.</p>
RTP-04-119	2/4/2004	Sedell, Mike	City Of Simi Valley	<p>1. The population forecast for 2010 and 2030 are over-estimated.</p> <p>2. The Plan estimates more than twice the rate of Thousand Oaks.</p> <p>3. The Plan estimates the city will absorb a higher proportion of the County's overall population increase than it has historically.</p> <p>4. The average household size is too low.</p> <p>5. The Plan projects the city will be adding twice the</p>	An adjustment to the forecasted growth for the Ventura County sub-region has been made in response to this comment.

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				number of dwelling units over the next 7 years than has been added for the past 13 years.	
RTP-04-120	2/5/2004	Arellano, Yazmin	City Of Brawley	<p>1. Imperial County listed in the "Shape and Pattern of Future Growth" section.</p> <p>2. Housing and Households section on page 32 is repeated.</p> <p>3. Imperial County not listed in Public Transportation tables in Ch. 2.</p> <p>4. Imperial County not mentioned in the Truck Travel section.</p> <p>5. No mention of the Imperial County Regional Cargo Airport or the relocation of the existing airport located in the City of Imperial.</p> <p>6. concerned with geographic equity. Include Imperial County in more sections of the plan.</p> <p>7. Table 7.1 Westmorland Bypass shall be replaces with Brawley Bypass Corridor.</p> <p>8. Table 7.1. The Inter/Intra County Passenger and Rail Freight Corridor was not discussed in any of the RTP chapters.</p>	<p>1. The comment is noted. In the context of the cited section related to growth surrounding the urban center of the region, not all counties are applicable</p> <p>2. Comment is noted and a correction will be made.</p> <p>3. Information shown in the tables in Chapter 2 are based on the data available in the National Transit Database (NTD).</p> <p>4. Comment duly noted. This section is intended to provide a generic region-wide description of the truck flow issues.</p> <p>5. Imperial County is still in the process of evaluating a replacement airport for Imperial County Airport, including its cargo handling potential. No new site has been determined for the potential replacement airport. SCAG will assist in this effort over the coming year. When a replacement site is determined, it will be added to the regional aviation plan.</p> <p>6. Comments noted about geographic equity. Even though it is not addressed separately, the RTP and technical appendices do present projected performance outcomes by county. SCAG will review these sections and expand them as appropriate.</p> <p>7. The SR-78 Brawley Bypass Corridor is already listed as a Baseline project in Technical Appendix I, page I-2.</p> <p>8. Table 7.1 identifies post-2030 long-range corridors, and by definition these corridors are not discussed as part of the financially constrained plan.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-121	2/5/2004	De La Loza, James L.	LACMTA	<p>1. The Final RTP should ensure that all committed MTA projects in their 2001 LRTP and 2003 SRTP are included in the RTP, particularly the following the projects...(see comment letter)</p> <p>2. Correct inaccurate implementation dates for the several highway projects in Los Angeles County (see comment letter)</p> <p>3. The US-101 (SR-23 to SR-13/SR-170) and I-710 Gateway Program corridor projects should not be identified at toll road facilities, since MTA has not taken any action to support this concept. Instead...should be identified as long-term highway corridor improvements that could be funded through other revenue enhancement strategies.</p> <p>4. The RTP should identify major transportation priorities from the Baseline or Tier 2 elements of the RTP.(see comment letter)</p> <p>5. The baseline and Tier 2 project list included in Appendix I contain no project cost information. SCAG should ensure that all MTA project costs identified in the MTA's 2001 LRTP and 2003 SRTP are fully covered in the RTP.</p> <p>6. SCAG needs to identify the specific projects that are tied to revenue projected from SB 314 (Murray) which would impose a 1/2 cent sales tax in LA County. (see comment letter)</p> <p>7. SCAG inaccurately characterizes LA County as operating at a deficit through 2030 with its committed programs and should clarify that the RTP assumes a more conservative revenue forecast than MTA, which projects full funding for its committed projects.</p> <p>8. the RTP must commit to fully funding all MTA priorities identified in MTA's LRTP and SRTP before funding non-MTA priorities in LA County.</p> <p>9. MTA supports the development of privately financed capacity enhancements for freight related</p>	<p>1a. The I-405/US-101 connector widening is listed as project LA996136 on page I-9 of Technical Appendix I.</p> <p>1b. The SR-71 widening is listed as project LA0B951 on page I-7 of Technical Appendix I.</p> <p>1c. The Green Line capital improvements are included in the RTP baseline financial assumptions.</p> <p>2. The implementation dates will be corrected.</p> <p>3. SCAG's Transportation and Communications Committee at its February 5, 2004 meeting recommended consideration of the following alternatives for the 2004 RTP in the US-101 Corridor (101/110 Interchange to SR 23/101 Interchange/Ventura County Line) and I-710 (Port of Long Beach to SR-60) Corridor: (a) US-101 Corridor (101/110 Interchange to SR 23/101 Interchange/Ventura County Line)- Potential capacity enhancements within the existing right of way or requiring minimum right of way acquisition on the segment from the 101/134/170 Interchange to the 23/101 Interchange at the Ventura County line. This will be based upon the results of further consultant analysis to be completed in February 2004; extensive Transportation System Management (TSM) and transit options, as appropriate, identified in the corridor study, as well as, priority near and midterm TSM and transit options, as appropriate, identified in the City of Los Angeles Community Advisory process for all portions of the 101 Corridor; and continued study of long term east-west travel needs in the 101/San Fernando Valley Corridor and further study of improvements to system connectivity and potential operational improvements to key Freeway/Freeway interchanges. The draft 2004 RTP identifies innovative public/private funding options for the constrained funding scenario to pay for construction of the additional capacity on this segment of the 101 corridor. SCAG is required to identify reasonable funding scenarios, and considers the option of user fee based innovative financing to be a viable option.</p> <p>b. I-710 (Port of Long Beach to SR-60) Corridor - Recognize the I-710 Transportation Corridor (SR-60 to the Port of Long Beach) as a Regionally Significant Transportation Corridor as identified in the adopted Statement of Purpose and Need of the I-710 Major Corridor Study (MCS); and, while additional work is in progress to identify feasible improvements in the corridor, the 2004 Regional Transportation Plan identifies existing commitments to replace the General Desmond Bridge as part of the financially constrained Plan, and the need to provide the equivalent of 2-lanes of additional capacity in each direction</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>projects, but believe more info is needed before an adequate assessment of the viability of RTP freight proposals can be made. MTA's primary concern is to ensure that local, state, or federal funding currently committed to MTA countywide priorities are not diverted to fund freight projects identified in the RTP.</p> <p>10. SCAG should ensure that the RTP's funding commitments are consistent with MTA plans and programs such as freight movements, freeway rehabilitation, etc....(see comment letter)</p> <p>Additional Comments related to text corrections/project descriptions from an ATTACHMENT TO LETTER</p> <p>Finance (Comments 1-3)</p> <p>Transit (Comments 4-9)</p> <p>TDM (Comments 10-21)</p> <p>Aviation(Comments 22-23)</p> <p>Highway Program (Comments 24-36)</p> <p>Freight Movement (Comments 37-44)</p>	<p>to move goods and people throughout the corridor; and, it is anticipated that a Locally Preferred Strategy (LPS), based upon the I-710 MCS (Alternative B-TSM/TDM) and a hybrid of the MCA Alternatives C, D & E will be adopted by the I-710 MCS Oversight Policy Committee, with the concurrence of LACMTA, Caltrans, SCAG and FHWA, SCAG will consider amendment to the 2004 RTP to include improvements as recommended, conditioned upon community acceptance, available funding, and regional air quality conformity requirements, and the 2004 RTP anticipates that additional public funding and/or innovative funding may be needed to fully fund the LPS.</p> <p>4. Comment noted.</p> <p>5. The Draft 2004 RTP assumptions for project costs are consistent with MTA's LRTP and SRTP.</p> <p>6. The Final 2004 RTP document will provide references to the specific projects tied to SB314 (the half cent sales tax initiative for Los Angeles County). The technical appendix should include more detailed information as necessary. Additionally, SCAG would proceed with amendments to the RTP as may be necessary in the event that SB314 is rejected by voters.</p> <p>7. Although SCAG's forecast was developed based upon the inputs provided by our local county transportation commissions including the LACMTA, SCAG's Highway and Transportation Finance Task Force made additional adjustments to include revenue impacts from alternative fuels, greater fuel efficiency and the gradual transition to an aging society. Accordingly, the Task Force approved a more conservative forecast than the LACMTA. This will be noted appropriately in the RTP.</p> <p>8. The Gerald Desmond Bridge replacement project will be included in the RTP Constrained Plan with funding from new or innovative sources that do not impact MTA's LRTP funds or project commitments.</p> <p>9. Comment noted.</p> <p>10. The RTP's funding commitments are consistent with MTA plans.</p> <p>*** Responses to the Attachments ***</p> <p>1) Please see response to comment #7 above.</p> <p>2) Same as above.</p> <p>3) Current language in the 2004 RTP clarifies that the Maglev and truck lane strategies are privately funded.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
					<p>4) The RTP will reflect the schedules based on the passage of SB 314.</p> <p>5) Correction will be made.</p> <p>6) The final RTP will not contain land use assumptions or forecast elements at the suggested level of geographic specificity. Rather the forecast included in the RTP will be at the sub-region level. SCAG will note the comment for use in future planning efforts.</p> <p>7) Revisions will be made.</p> <p>8) The RTP does consider that Metro Green Line extension will be entirely funded by non-MTA funds. The completion year for this project has been moved to 2020 in the Final 2004 RTP.</p> <p>9) The Draft 2004 RTP allocation of \$293 million (constant 2002 dollars) towards transit capital funding through the Call for Projects is consistent with the 2001 LRTP constrained plan allocation of \$438 million (inflated dollars).</p> <p>10) In response to State (Caltrans) and Federal (DOT/FHWA-FTA,EPA)planning regulations SCAG is required to consider and include region-wide TDM goals/objectives/programs/strategies that, as alternatives to single-occupant driving, will result in reduced congestion, delay and emissions. Since 1998, it is the adopted policy of SCAG and the Association has adopted specific TDM goals in the Regional Transportation Plan, and in 2002 placed regional and county-level investment guidelines in the RTIP for non-motorized, rideshare, ITS/Traveler information and TDM (Par & Ride Lots, Telecommute, etc.). As such, the 2004 RTP specifies appropriate regional (six counties) TDM goals for ridesharing (carpools and vanpools), and telework/telecommute and work-at-home. Through the Association's Overall Work Program subregional planning efforts, SCAG can work with each county to identify appropriate rideshare tracking and documentation methods.</p> <p>11) These investments are identified by each county transportation commission and provided to SCAG as funding available to address Trip Reduction and TDM goals/programs/strategies.</p> <p>12) TDM funding levels shown are identified by each county transportation commission and provided to SCAG as funding available to address Trip Reduction and TDM goals/programs/strategies including ITS/Traveler Information Programs.</p> <p>13) In response to State (Caltrans) and Federal (DOT/FHWA-FTA,EPA)planning regulations SCAG is required to consider and include region-wide TDM goals/objectives/programs/strategies that, as alternatives to single-occupant driving, will result in reduced congestion, delay and emissions. Since 1998, it is the adopted policy of SCAG and the Association has adopted specific TDM goals in the Regional Transportation Plan, and in 2002 placed regional and county-level investment guidelines in the RTIP for non-motorized, rideshare,</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
					<p>ITS/Traveler information and TDM (Par & Ride Lots, Telecommute, etc.).</p> <p>14) TDM funding levels shown are identified by each county transportation commission and provided to SCAG as funding available to address Trip Reduction and TDM goals/programs/strategies including ITS/Traveler Information Programs.</p> <p>15) Page 76, table 4.3 lists the anticipated funding level for ITS/Traveler Information activities described on page 72.</p> <p>16) Since 1998, it is the adopted policy of SCAG and the Association has adopted specific TDM goals in the Regional Transportation Plan including Vanpool goals, and in 2002 placed regional and county-level investment guidelines in the RTIP for non-motorized, rideshare, vanpool and ITS/Traveler information and TDM (Par & Ride Lots, Telecommute, etc.).</p> <p>17) Since 1998, it is the adopted policy of SCAG and the Association has adopted specific TDM goals in the Regional Transportation Plan including Vanpool goals, and in 2002 placed regional and county-level investment guidelines in the RTIP for non-motorized, rideshare, vanpool and ITS/Traveler information and TDM (Par & Ride Lots, Telecommute, etc.). Promotion and marketing of the appropriate "TDM" goals/programs/strategies should help produce the transportation benefits/outcomes desired.</p> <p>18) The Draft 2004 RTP allocation of \$175 million (constant 2002 dollars) towards TDM is consistent with the 2001 LRTP constrained plan allocation of \$260 million (inflated dollars).</p> <p>19) SCAG will work with MTA staff to ensure consistency with MTA budgetary actions.</p> <p>20) The Draft 2004 RTP allocation of \$432 million (constant 2002 dollars) towards Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements and Transportation Enhancements is consistent with the 2001 LRTP constrained plan allocation of \$711 million (inflated dollars).</p> <p>21) The Draft 2004 RTP allocation of \$653 million (constant 2002 dollars) towards ITS (Signal Synchronization & Bus Speed Improvements) is consistent with the 2001 LRTP constrained plan allocation of \$929 million (inflated dollars).</p> <p>22) A dialogue has been established between SCAG and LAWA regarding LAWA's proposed role in adopting the Preferred Aviation Plan in the Draft 2004 RTP. In a letter SCAG received from LAWA dated February 9, 2004, LAWA declared its support for the implementation of the Regional Aviation Plan, and its commitment to work with SCAG to implement the plan through master plans being developed for LAX, Ontario and Palmdale airports. The Preferred Aviation Plan, including its Implementation Strategy was developed and vetted before the SCAG Aviation Task Force. All commercial airports in</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
					<p>the SCAG region are represented on the Aviation Task Force as well as stakeholder cities near airports and various air industry representatives. Non-LAWA airports have expressed their support for the airport consortium concept through their representation on the Aviation Task Force, provided that the consortium does not have preemptive land use powers over individual airports. The exact makeup, responsibilities and powers that the airport consortium will be specified in more detail through SCAG's continuing planning process over the next year, in the development of a Regional Aviation Implementation Plan. Past efforts to survey air carriers about their attitudes concerning regional airport alternatives have not been fruitful due to the highly proprietary and competitive nature of the airline industry. An airport ground access element will be included in the Final 2004 RTP, which will show critically needed ground access improvements and associated costs in the service areas of each airport, needed to accommodate their passenger and cargo forecasts in the Preferred Aviation Plan.</p> <p>23) Air carrier airports in California due not use any state funding to support on-airport improvement projects. The costs and potential funding sources for ground access projects needed to support the Preferred Aviation Plan, will be identified in an airport ground access element in the Final 2004 RTP.</p> <p>24) The text will be corrected.</p> <p>25) 710 Gap Closure HOV</p> <p>The 710 Gap Closure represents a significant regional need. The 710 HOV Gap Closure has been included in previous Regional Transportation Plans, including the 2001 RTP. Partial funding for the completion of various elements of the 710 HOV Gap Closure project is included in the 2002 RTIP and in previous TIPs. The completion of this project is proposed for 2020 in the Final 2004 RTP.</p> <p>26) 710 Gap Closure General</p> <p>See response to No. 25 above.</p> <p>27) The table will be corrected to include the SR-18 project.</p> <p>28) See response to No. 3.</p> <p>29) See Response to No. 3</p> <p>30) Comment noted.</p> <p>31) The implementation schedule will be corrected.</p> <p>32) Comment noted.</p> <p>33) The LRTP allocation for SHOPP is included in the RTP baseline assumptions.</p> <p>34) The LRTP allocations for incident management and SAFE are included in the RTP baseline assumptions.</p> <p>35) The Draft 2004 RTP allocation of \$547 million (constant 2002 dollars) towards regional surface transportation improvements is consistent with the 2001 LRTP constrained plan allocation of \$817</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
 (Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
					<p>million (inflated dollars).</p> <p>36) The Draft 2004 RTP allocation of \$3.1 billion (constant 2002 dollars) towards state highway and arterial system preservation is consistent with the adopted goals of the RTP as well as direction from the Regional Council. System preservation refers to maintenance, and should not be compared to operations investments as is suggested by the comment.</p> <p>37) Comment noted.</p> <p>38) Emission benefits are not assumed for Maglev nor Truck Lanes for the transportation conformity demonstration by the attainment year 2010. However, Maglev and as well as strategies to accommodate future truck traffic are expected to have positive impact on air quality upon completion of such facilities. SCAG will be evaluating the emission benefits with or without these strategies for out years to assess the impacts of these strategies.</p> <p>39) SCAG recognizes that additional studies will be necessary to narrow down the optimum toll in conjunction with the appropriate corridor studies that SCAG hopes to pursue in cooperation with MTA, Caltrans and other stake holders as we further refine these strategies.</p> <p>40) SCAG's regional council took an action in December of 2004 to dissociate Operation Jump Start from the 2004 RTP. As a result, all reference to Operation Jump Start will be removed from the 2004 RTP.</p> <p>41) Comment noted.</p> <p>42) See response to comment No. 8.</p> <p>43) Comment noted. SCAG will be pursuing the East-West Gateway corridor studies in cooperation with MTA, Caltrans and other stakeholders to further refine and develop appropriate strategy to address the goods movement issue along this corridor.</p> <p>44) Comment noted. SCAG recognizes the sensitivity of this issue and the need for additional evaluation and public debate prior to formulating a recommendation.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-122	2/5/2004	Solow, David	SCRRA	<p>1. The RTP should clearly state that MAGLEV will be funded only with non-public funding sources and will not impact State or Federal funding in the SCAG region. It is overly optimistic to expect that the IOS between West L.A. and Ontario Airport will be operating in 2010, a mere 6 yrs. from today.</p> <p>2. SCAG has yet to address SCRRA staff's serious concerns related to service competition with Metrolink, the ability of local agencies to provide adequate parking and transit access, the reasonableness of Maglev ridership projections, right-of-way and construction conflicts which would impact Metrolink operations and future growth, and finally the impact of Maglev on Metrolink subsidy and operating costs.</p> <p>3. Page 135 of the RTP recommends implementing a policy initiative called Operation Jump Start. An independent financial analysis of this proposal has not been performed to determine the viability of the SCAG project before inclusion in the RTP. (see more comments on this in comment letter)</p> <p>4. Please make correction to Paragraph titled "Metrolink Commuter Rail" in Executive Summary on page 7. (see comment letter)</p>	<p>1. Several independent consultants prepared the feasibility studies along four corridors in the SCAG region. All four studies concluded that the Maglev system is financially, operationally and constructively feasible. Furthermore, the feasibility studies for the four corridors demonstrate that the Maglev system can be constructed through a public-private partnership structure administered through a public agency, a joint powers authority (JPA), or a public non-profit (PNP) format using a number of innovative and traditional funding mechanisms. The construction of the system would be financed through tax-exempt bonds and Federal Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovative Act (TIFIA) program loans that would be repaid through project-generated revenues. No operating subsidies would be required. SCAG is currently working to secure federal pre-deployment funding as part of the Re-Authorization of the Transportation Equity Act to complete preliminary engineering for the Federal Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and the State Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Pending funding levels and local match contributions for pre-deployment and EIR/EIS, the IOS from Ontario Airport to West Los Angeles should be deployed by 2018. Transfer of this technology to the SCAG region is highly applicable and can be accomplished within the proposed time frame.</p> <p>2. In Milestone 2 (Analysis of ROW and Commuter Rail Impact) of the Initial Operating Segment feasibility study, these concerns are addressed. Corrections related to Metrolink statistics will be incorporated in the final report. Operation Jump Start was an initiative to accelerate rail and truck lane projects and has not been endorsed by the RC at this point.</p> <p>3. SCAG's regional council, at their December 2003 meeting took an action to dissociate Operation Jump Start from the 2004 RTP. As a result, all reference to Operation Jump Start will be removed from the final RTP.</p> <p>4. Corrections will be reflected in the Final RTP.</p>
RTP-04-123	2/5/2004	Maldonado, Joan		Please support improvements to I-5 and SR-14 in the 2004 RTP.	Comment noted.
RTP-04-124	2/5/2004	Powers, Richard R.	Gateway Cities COG	1. The current Growth Visioning Map as developed by SCAG does not represent the position of the Gateway Cities subregion and shall not be considered as part of the 2004 RTP.	1. SCAG will consider comments on the Preliminary COMPASS Growth Vision map in future planning efforts. The Draft RTP does not contain assumptions on development and projects at the suggested level of specificity.

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-125	2/5/2004	Carranza, P E, Tomas	LADOT	<p>In Appendix I (Project List) of the Draft RTP, Project ID LA996390 should be removed from the list. The City of Los Angeles has changed the scope of work for the Sepulveda Boulevard between Lincoln & Centinela project. Instead of widening to provide an exclusive bus/carpool priority lane, the scope has changed to provide mainly streetscape elements. No added roadway capacity will be provided along this segment of Sepulveda Boulevard. Please remove this project from the list.</p> <p>Tomas Carranza, P.E. City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation 213-485-1062</p>	Project LA 996390 is a Transportation Control Measure (TCM) and cannot be deleted from the Regional Transportation Improvement Program without programming a substitute project that provides the same emissions benefits. SCAG staff is in communication with the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA) to discuss this issue.
RTP-04-126	2/5/2004	Kanter, Ph.D., Robert	Port of Long Beach	<p>1) Maritime Ports & Waterways - "It should be noted that 35% of nation's waterborne containers cited actually move through the Ports of Long Beach/LA.....For clarification, the Port of Long Beach is proposing to spend about \$2 billion on terminal infrastructure projects over the next 10-15 years."</p> <p>2) RTP Projects - MTA Board approved the inclusion of the Gerald Desmond Bridge Replacement project in the RTP. (see comment letter attachment)</p> <p>3) I-710 Corridor - "The draft RTP contains truck lanes on the I-710 to be financed entirely by tolls. It is premature to specify truck lanes in the RTP at this time as the I-710 Corridor Study is still in progress.preliminarily analyses conducted by Gateway Cities and MTA indicate that tolls could not finance the entire project... the RTP finding regarding tolls undermines the aforementioned TEA-3 funding request put forth by COG/City/Port. It is recommended that the RTP indicate that the I-710 Corridor improvements will be funded through some combination of public funds and innovative financing."</p>	<p>1. Appropriate revisions, as suggested, will be incorporated into the Final 2004 RTP.</p> <p>2. Gerald Desmond Bridge Replacement is included in the constrained portion of the 2004 RTP.</p> <p>3. The 2004 RTP calls for capacity enhancement to address goods movement along the I-710 corridor without specifying what the improvements would entail. However, for modeling purposes, more specificity is needed and as a result the corridor was modeled as two truck lanes in each direction. It is clearly indicated in the Final Draft 2004 RTP that this project will continue to be studied for ultimate selection of the locally preferred strategy. At the conclusion of the local process, locally preferred strategy will replace the strategy in the 2004 RTP for this corridor if and as necessary.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-127	2/6/2004	Sugita, Hideo D.	Riverside County Transportation Commission	<p>1. Operation Jumpstart - RCTC supports the removal of reference to Operation Jumpstart as was approved by SCAG's RC Dec. 4th mtg. In addition, SCAG must be prepared to develop alternatives in coordination with the CTCs in the event federal funding is not approved by these projects.</p> <p>2. Dedicated Truck Lanes - Dedicated truck lanes in the urban setting will be extremely costly and SCAG needs to factor in the cost/benefit of such a mega project. Although the draft RTP does not call out the use of triple trailers on dedicated truck lanes, we would be opposed to allowing triple trailers onto these facilities.</p> <p>3. Rail/Freight Goods Movement - We feel that the RTP should stress the need to capitalize on increased container fees as a mechanism to support infrastructure. (see comment letter)</p> <p>4. High Occupancy Toll Lanes - CETAP Inter-county Corridors should not be referenced as High Occupancy Toll (HOT) lanes. Identifying them as "potential" HOT lanes is acceptable. It is premature for us to identify which new corridors will be HOT lanes as we have-not completed the environmental process.</p> <p>5. Public Transportation System - Reference is made to "restructuring service to ensure efficient utilization of available capacity". This needs to be expanded upon as to what re-structuring means and how it would be applied given the variations of transit service throughout the SCAG region.</p> <p>6. Land Use-Transit Coord/Other Transit Recomm – This section, albeit beneficial for transit, does not have any mechanism in place to enforce many of the statements. We agree that the RTP should highlight the importance of linking land use and transit coordination, however, blanket statements that are not enforceable or applicable throughout the SCAG region should not be included so that the public is not misled.</p>	<p>1. Comment noted. All reference to Operation Jump Start will be removed from the Final RTP.</p> <p>2. Comment noted. SCAG recognizes the need for and proposes to further evaluate and study all options to enhance the capacity of select highways corridors to accommodate future movement of goods in our region. SCAG further recognizes that allowing triple trailers on our road facilities is a very sensitive issue that needs further scrutiny and public debate.</p> <p>3. This concept is currently being studied in the SCAG Port and Modal Diversion Study.</p> <p>4. Comment noted. The final RTP will be revised to reflect the CETAP corridors as noted.</p> <p>5. Restructuring of transit service is referring to the current efforts by transit providers such as MTA in implementing the recommendations of various Transit Restructuring studies that they have completed or are currently underway.</p> <p>6. The intent of these recommendations are to emphasize the need for better and increased coordination between land use planning and transportation. SCAG, as the regional planning agency can not mandate policy and/or regulations on the local jurisdictions. Development of policies and the mechanisms to enforce them are the responsibility of local jurisdictions.</p> <p>7a. The Chapter 4 discussion regarding TDM includes rideshare (carpool and vanpool), work-at-home (telecommute/telework and home-based business) and non-motorized transportation (bicycle and pedestrian). Technical Appendix D-2, Transportation Demand Management provides additional detail to the summary discussion. The reference to TDM/transit will be eliminated in the final RTP.</p> <p>7b. "Social commitments" addresses all aspects of personal travel needs and transportation mode choice including single-occupant drivers. Technical Appendix D-2, Transportation Demand Management provides additional detail to the summary discussion.</p> <p>7c. Table 4.3 includes TDM investments (park'in'ride, telecommute/telework/work-at-home, etc.), and splits out non-motorized (bike and pedestrian), rideshare (carpool and vanpool) and ITS/Traveler investments. The latter is noted due to its documented link to pre-trip travel planning information required to make an informed mode choice</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>7. TDM - It is important that this section also identify who the formal and informal players (public and private sector agencies) are that participate in the TDM arena and what roles they play. The RTP does NOT take credit for their investments which in some cases is substantial. We do not concur with the goals/recommendations in this section as the reality of achieving them is highly unlikely. The goals must be measurable and we do not believe that these goals can be measured.</p> <p>RCTC does not agree with programming local funds for our Commuter Assistance Project in the RTIP as these funds are primarily local sales tax dollars and are not otherwise required to be included in the RTIP.</p> <p>Further, the importance of Rule 2202 should be identified as a critical element of the region's TDM efforts...</p> <p>8. Aviation and Maglev - concerned that the 8 MAP assigned to March Air Reserve is unrealistic. (see comment letter for further concern on this)</p> <p>8a) concerned regarding the feasibility of MAGLEV in relation to the aviation forecast. If MAGLEV is not built, how will this impact the aviation forecast? Strongly recommends that SCAG coordinate the development of the forecast with the March Joint Powers Authority.</p> <p>9. Finance - Strongly suggest that SCAG continue reviewing all funding options as a backup in the event any of the strategy(s) are not realized. We support SCAG in their efforts to advocate for enhanced transportation funding at the local, state and federal levels to meet the demands on our transportation system.</p> <p>10. Growth Forecast - Recommend that SCAG work closely with the jurisdictions to reach consensus on where the density is most appropriate and feasible. We also need to ensure that the recent work on the County's general plan update is incorporated in the</p>	<p>decision.</p> <p>7d. In response to State (Caltrans) and Federal (DOT/FHWA-FTA,EPA)planning regulations SCAG is required to consider and include region-wide TDM goals/objectives/programs/strategies that, as alternatives to single-occupant driving, will result in reduced congestion, delay and emissions. Since 1998, it is the adopted policy of SCAG and the Association has adopted specific TDM goals in the Regional Transportation Plan, and in 2002 placed regional and county-level investment guidelines in the RTIP for non-motorized, rideshare, ITS/Traveler information and TDM (Park & Ride Lots, Telecommute, etc.).</p> <p>As such, the 2004 RTP specifies appropriate regional (six counties) TDM goals for ridesharing (carpools and vanpools), and telework/telecommute and work-at-home. Through the Association's Overall Work Program subregional planning efforts, SCAG can work with each county to identify appropriate rideshare tracking and documentation methods. In addition, Air Quality Management District rules and regulations are properly the subject of the respective air basin's air quality management plan.</p> <p>7e. Comments noted - Technical Appendix D-2, Transportation Demand Management provides additional detail regarding telecommute/telework and work-at-home TDM goals.</p> <p>7f. Comment noted - "average yearly investment" language will be used in lieu of "target" in the final 2004 RTP. In addition, SCAG requests that the commissions provide this information for projects not programmed in the RTIP via the RTIP development process.</p> <p>8. Preliminary capacity analysis conducted by SCAG indicates that the capacity of March Field's one runway, with forecast military operations, is about 10 MAP. As a comparison, the capacity of San Diego International's one runway has been estimated at 18.7 MAP (the airport currently serves 15 MAP). Also, the 160 acre parcel on the west side of the airport that is reserved for civilian use is judged to be large enough to accommodate a passenger terminal serving 8 MAP. As a comparison, up until recently the Burbank Airport Authority was considering building a new terminal on a 130 acre parcel it had acquired, which was adequate for a 20 gate passenger terminal complex serving 14 MAP (although it was being planned with only 14 gates). It is acknowledged that March Inland Port is more focused on cargo operations in the short-term. At the request of the March Joint Powers Authority, the following language was attached to the March 8 MAP forecast in the 2004 RTP: "The primary objective of March Inland Port is</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				2004 RTP. Also see "Specific Comments with Page References" in comment document.	<p>cargo operations. SCAG projections assume commercial passenger service not yet contemplated by the March Joint Powers Commission. Air Force Reserve activity at March is projected to remain at 51,426 annual operations. SCAG has a long standing policy to give priority to military and national defense needs." Ground access improvements in the March service area needed to accommodate 8 MAP at March Inland Port will be identified in an airport ground access element in the Final 2004 RTP. It is acknowledged that the 8 MAP forecast for March by 203 is reliant on Maglev access. If Maglev is not built, the forecast for March would likely be about 2 MAP.</p> <p>9. SCAG will continue to work on legislative implementation strategies for the financial plan proposed in the 2004 RTP. Certainly, it is imperative that SCAG advocate for increased transportation funding for the region. SCAG intends to continue evaluating additional funding opportunities as may be applicable to the region's ongoing transportation needs.</p> <p>10. SCAG remains committed to a cooperative approach with local governments on growth issues, and intends to continue the COMPASS/Growth Visioning effort beyond this RTP. An adjustment to the forecasted growth for unincorporated areas in both the Western Riverside and Coachella Valley sub-regions has been made in response to this comment.</p>
RTP-04-128	2/6/2004	Finnegan, Stephen	Automobile Club of Southern California	<p>Transportation Finance</p> <p>1. Condition the proposed 10-cent per gallon increase in the state's gasoline tax and other transportation tax and fee increases, on the protection and dedicated use of existing transportation revenues for transportation purposes.</p> <p>2. Once the diversion and borrowing of transportation revenues for other purposes has been stopped, develop a longer-term strategy to establish appropriate revenue for transportation needs.</p>	<p>1. Indeed, it is critical to protect the region's existing transportation revenues. Page 113 of the RTP emphasizes this very point. SCAG is working in coordination with the region's transportation partners to protect these revenues from being diverted to finance the General Fund. Nevertheless, there is a longer-term transportation funding crisis that must be addressed as well. The financial strategies proposed in the Draft 2004 RTP, including the gas tax increase proposal, attempt to highlight revenue enhancement initiatives that are likely to be implemented over the long term (within the timeframe of the RTP – through 2030). SCAG recognizes that there are significant challenges associated with many of these initiatives. Accordingly, SCAG welcomes further input and coordinated effort to continue to explore these and</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>3. Provide more information on the proposal to issue debt against a substantial portion of increased fuel tax revenues in an effort to advance RTP projects,</p> <p>4. Include revenue from all county transportation sales tax measures that are likely to be enacted or renewed with the RTP Time period. Toll and HOT Lanes/Roads</p> <p>5. New tolls should not be imposed on any existing streets or freeway lanes. Tolls should only be considered as one of several methods to fund new highway construction. Tolls should only be used for new highway construction when other funding options are not available and when safeguards are in place regarding how toll revenues can be used and that allow construction of new highway capacity adjacent to the new toll facility. Toll revenues should not be used as a justification for weakening established state and federal safety rules that prohibit the use of LCVs in California.</p> <p>Goods Movement/Truck Lanes</p> <p>6. Maintain current truck size and weight standards in California.</p> <p>7. Provide more information on the financial viability of, and funding options for, proposed dedicated truck lanes and major freight rail improvements. Project Priorities</p> <p>8. Ensure needed and effective large-scale highway and transit projects remain, or are included, in the constrained portion of the final RTP to allow for continuing development work and resolution of environmental, community, and funding issues. The Auto Club urges SCAG to include the following projects, amongst many other needed improvements in the Final RTP (see list in comment letter)</p> <p>9. Require additional evaluation and public input before including MAGLEV, even if privately funded, in the draft RTP. SCAG should further scrutinize the</p>	<p>perhaps other viable long-term transportation funding solutions.</p> <p>2. See response to comment 1.</p> <p>3. SCAG recognizes the concerns raised with regard to the proposed debt financing initiative. Certainly, issuing debt to finance projects would require careful consideration of interest and issuance costs against the benefits accrued from accelerated construction.</p> <p>4. The financial strategies proposed in the Draft 2004 RTP was developed with the guidance of the Highway and Transportation Finance Task Force. Elected representatives of cities and counties along with staff members of partner transportation agencies comprise this Task Force. Specifically, representatives from both Ventura County Transportation Commission and Orange County Transportation Authority requested that SCAG not include new or renewal sales tax measure initiatives for their respective counties in the Draft 2004 RTP. Since then, VCTC has been considering the imposition of a new sales tax initiative for transportation. This recent effort will be noted in the text of the Final 2004 RTP. OCTA, however, maintains that SCAG should not include a renewal assumption for Orange County.</p> <p>5. The 2004 RTP does not propose tolling existing facilities. However, the 2004 RTP does propose considering user fee as a potential means of funding new facilities where feasible and viable. SCAG recognizes that allowing use of LCVs is a sensitive issue that needs further evaluation, consideration and public debate.</p> <p>6. Comment noted. Truck size and weight standards are established through federal and state legislative authorities.</p> <p>7. Financial analysis developed to date is included in the Technical Appendix.</p> <p>8. Comments regarding recommendation to keep large scale highway and transit projects in the constrained RTP are noted.</p> <p>9. Four independent feasibility studies were conducted on the Southern California Maglev system. The feasibility studies for the four corridors demonstrate that the Maglev system can be constructed through a public-private partnership structure administered through a public agency, a joint powers authority (JPA), or a public non-profit (PNP) format using a number of innovative and traditional funding mechanisms. Nonetheless, evaluations of each segment are ongoing.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				financial, political and other environmental feasibility and mobility benefits of this proposal before proceeding further. SCAG should also redirect planning and other resources being expended on Maglev to other nearer-term and more beneficial projects.	Phase 1, including feasibility studies and pre-deployment analysis for the Initial Operating Segment from Ontario Airport to West Los Angeles was completed in December, 2003. Public input has been involved in Maglev since initiation in 1998. Evaluations of each segment are ongoing. Phase 1, including feasibility studies and pre-deployment analysis for the Initial Operating Segment was completed in December. Additional analysis will be undertaken through Phase 2 with preliminary engineering and EIR/EIS documentation. Four independent analyst firms and the private sector have scrutinized the financial and technological feasibility of Maglev. Comment noted.
RTP-04-129	2/6/2004	Venable, James A.	County Of Riverside	<p>1. Transportation Finance - Recommends initiatives to be pursued to augment revenues: a) Accelerate increase in gas tax from proposed implementation date of 2010; b) Examine assessing increased truck fees, with particular focus on truck weight, weight per axle, and VMT. This strategy should also be considered equally in San Diego Co.; e) develop mechanisms to ensure alternative fuel vehicles contribute a fair share. Additionally, future RTP's should be prepared with the transportation strategy serving as the foundation for developing the financing strategy, rather than vice-versa.</p> <p>2. Growth Forecast- a) SCAG should consider a declining workforce to obtain a rate for 2030forecast year. b) ...the Plan fails to mention that the majority of job loss occurred in Los Angeles where the effects of the recession had a greater impact. During the same period, the Inland Empire experienced a net gain in jobs in local government, mgmt. and education. It is not clear how the regional outlook will effect the development of the local employment projections.</p> <p>3. Freight Movement Projects - concerned that several regional initiatives that serve as cornerstones of the Plan, such as Maglev and dedicated truck lanes, continue to lack consensus support and a reliable source of funding. It is imperative that they have established institutional/organizational arrangements charged with and capable of implementing such projects. A multi-county effort is</p>	<p>1. SCAG staff recognizes that language may have been misinterpreted. Accordingly, all language referencing the TUMF will be clarified as appropriate. Nevertheless, the reference to the TUMF in conjunction with the 2009 expiration year is specific to the Coachella Valley Association of Governments (CVAG's) TUMF program. The CVAG TUMF ordinance became effective July 1, 1989. CVAG's TUMF program is a component of the existing Measure "A" -- a sales tax measure approved by the voters of Riverside County in November of 1988. Moreover, SCAG intends to further evaluate options for enhancing the region's transportation revenue stream. WRCOG's input is greatly appreciated.</p> <p>2a) The slower growth in labor force after 2010 due to aging was the basis for job projection and a relatively low unemployment rate. However, the unemployment rate was revised upward to reflect the recent trends that the region's job growth was over-projected by 450,000, while population was under estimated by 300,000. The imbalance between population and job and implied higher unemployment rate was carried to 2030. SCAG will monitor the job, population and unemployment rate trends constantly, and revisit their short-term and long-term relationships in the next forecast cycle.</p> <p>2b) The recent employment trends were discussed at the regional level. While absolute job losses were recorded in Los Angeles and Orange Counties, Inland Empire only experienced "slower" job growth than previously forecasted.</p> <p>3. While the Draft 2004 RTP identifies a number of freeway corridors for potential capacity enhancement to accommodate future growth in goods movement, specific improvements or alignments are considered subject of future studies and consensus building work. Such further studies would also address the other points made here.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>needed to gain a clear understanding of the cost benefits of the proposed strategies to optimize system performance, The region needs to continue to examine the feasibility of expanded truck and port operations as well as staggered work schedules as a practical way to maximize the massive public transportation investment by lessening the peak-hour traffic system impacts.</p> <p>4. Aviation - Believe that Orange Co. still needs to address its future aviation needs. There appear to be an extremely high aviation demand forecast of 170 MAP in the year 2030 when compared to historical trend and the existing 77 MAP. Plans for 8 MAP at the March facility significantly exceed existing policy set by the March JPA for passenger travel at this time. (see comment letter)</p> <p>5. Maglev - Given the concerns noted regarding the aviation demand forecast, what is the sensitivity of Maglev feasibility to potential variations in aviation demands? To further complicate the issue, the Plan state that during the modeling, efforts were made to boost Maglev ridership to the suburban airports.</p> <p>6. Land Use and Transportation - Commends SCAG for its efforts related to Compass, however believes that much work is still needed for local jurisdictions to understand the potential implications of the regional strategy on local government authority and remain uncertain about whether support from the local jurisdictional level is strong as it relates to this initiative. SCAG should devote significant time and resources to continue public outreach regarding this strategy, including participation from the subregions between now and the scheduled Plan adoption date.</p> <p>7. Air Quality/Conformity - Requests that renewed efforts be taken to revisit existing conformity regulations due to the penalties imposed on regional and local governments through the potential loss of billions in transportation funds if the RTP does not meet conformity. The SCAG region is held accountable for attainment measures and strategies</p>	<p>4a) The 170 MAP forecast represents a 4.2% average annual passenger increase from 2003 levels. In comparison, the FAA forecasts a 3.6% passenger increase for U.S. flag carriers in the 2003-2014 time period. The SCAG forecast is somewhat higher for the following reasons: (1) The Preferred Aviation Plan, in its decentralization of long-haul and international service from LAX to Ontario, Palmdale and March Inland Port airports, will create a significant amount of "induced" demand by placing that service closer to populations in fast growing areas. It will also create a significant amount of "catalytic" demand that is created in when businesses are attracted to locate around expanding airports that have developable land around them. (2) Maglev itself will also create additional "induced" demand by virtue of increasing the speed and predictability of the airport access trip for many air passengers. (3) The region's position on the Pacific Rim is expected to capture increasing international travel to and from rapidly developing countries in Asia, particularly China. (4) Lastly, the forecast horizon of the plan to 2030 will capture the retirement of the large baby boomer segment of the population, and retirees travel at greater than average rates.</p> <p>4b) See response to comment no. 570.</p> <p>4c) Comment noted. Ground access improvements in the March service area needed to accommodate 8 MAP at March Inland Port will be identified in an airport ground access element in the Final 2004 RTP.</p> <p>4d) See response to comment no. 570.</p> <p>5. Maglev Funding The feasibility studies for the four corridors demonstrate that the Maglev system can be constructed through a public-private partnership structure administered through a public agency, a joint powers authority (JPA), or a public non-profit (PNP) format using a number of innovative and traditional funding mechanisms. The construction of the system would be financed through tax-exempt bonds and Federal Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovative Act (TIFIA) program loans that would be repaid through project-generated revenues. No operating subsidies would be required. SCAG is currently working to secure federal pre-deployment funding as part of the 2003 Re-Authorization of the Transportation Equity Act to complete the Federal Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and the State Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Also, the feasibility studies have been completed through funding support from Congress, the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), the United States Department of Transportation (USDOT), the Los Angeles World Airport, the County Transportation Commissions, Caltrans and</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				to demonstrate conformity that are the responsibility of the Calif. Air Resources Board and the EPA. These agencies however are unaffected by any penalties comparable to the billions lost to the region if conformity is not achieved.	state/local coalitions in the SCAG region. SCAG is working for the development of the JPA along the IOS and securing a local match for federal grants from the City of Ontario, City of Los Angeles, San Bernardino Association of Governments and other cities along the corridor. The Maglev System Deployment is expected to expand the total regional aviation demand by complementing and enhancing the decentralized aviation strategy proposed in the plan. 6. Comment is duly noted. SCAG remains committed to a cooperative approach with local governments on growth issues, and intends to continue the COMPASS/Growth Visioning effort beyond this RTP. 7. Comments are duly noted.
RTP-04-130	2/6/2004	Alan Murphy	John Wayne Airport	RTP sections relating to "Adjustments to Aviation Strategy" (Chapter 1) and "Aviation" (Chapter 4) accurately reflect the MAP (million annual passengers) numbers contained in the JWA Settlement Agreement Amendment.	Comment noted.
RTP-04-131	2/6/2004	Murphy, Alan	John Wayne Airport	1. Page 3.3-17. Under Regional Aviation System John Wayne's Airport location would be more accurate if Campus Drive was cited as an access route rather than Michaelson Drive.	Comment noted
RTP-04-132	2/7/2004	Hatala, THE HATALA FAMILY		As concerned homeowners and taxpayers in the city of Huntington Beach, we wish to voice our OPPOSITION To ANY FURTHER EXPANSION OR INCREASED FLIGHTS AT LONG BEACH AIRPORT. In the past two years our area of Huntington Beach has been subjected to an unacceptable level of noise from arriving flights at LGB. Our once peaceful neighborhoods are constantly under assault from the whine of jet engines and the exhaust they emit. It is unacceptable to be forced to stop a conversation INSIDE OUR HOME to wait for a jet to pass over in order to hear or be heard. We feel our concerns are valid are not being addressed by the agencies making the decisions regarding LGB as it exists NOW. We are very concerned about any talk of increased flights.	Comment noted

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-133	2/7/2004	Teplitz, Richard		I live in Westchester near LAX. We already have too much of the burden of regional air needs, both for passengers and freight. Make El Toro viable or let South OC strangle on the 405 and in their own pollution and delays. Why should we take the hit for them? Nobody is asking to cut LAX back (the FAIR situation) just don't make this little (you know it is) airport do more than it reasonably, safely can. And don't destroy our neighborhood to save that of a bunch of selfish bastards. I am a graduate of UC Irvine, 1973. I know these people. They are selfish beyond belief.	Comment noted.
RTP-04-134	2/7/2004	Orona, Ruben		Concerned with congestion with morning traffic on I-5/SR-14 (southbound). Suggestion to reduce this congestion is to open one lane on the I-5 at the Balboa Exit and have that lane come back to the I-5. This lane would be used by commuters that would be going to the 210 freeway. This lane is simply a bypass to the 210 freeway. It will eliminate congestion.	Comment noted.
RTP-04-135	2/7/2004	Watt, Ann		<p>a. The 2004 RTP - Destination 2030 is fatally flawed because it removed El Toro Airport from the planning process prematurely by assuming all other airports in the Southern California region will be able to expand.</p> <p>b. In fact, an assumption is made that Ontario Airport expand to a 30 MAP airport by 2030 to accommodate its own population needs, and to accommodate increased demand from Orange County.</p> <p>c. Ontario has thousands of minority Hispanic residents with their schools and churches contiguous with the west end of the runways under the normal takeoff flight path into the prevailing on-shore wind from the west.</p> <p>d. Ontario Airport would be prevented from expanding under the environmental equity clause for minorities "environmental justice."</p> <p>e. Further, Ontario Airport is shut down due to excessive crosswinds during seasonal Santa Ana wind conditions -every time it snows on Mt. Baldy or there is a cold high pressure cell located to the east in</p>	<p>a . The Preferred Aviation Plan does not assume that all other airports will be able to expand. LAX, Burbank, John Wayne, Long Beach and Ontario airports are all assumed to stay at their existing physical or legal capacity through 2030. Airports in Palmdale and the Inland Empire are assumed to be unconstrained.</p> <p>b . Ontario is assumed to be constrained to its physical capacity.</p> <p>c . Aviation related environmental impacts, including noise and air quality, were examined in the Environmental Impact Report. Environmental Justice impacts were also considered as part of the Regional Transportation Plan.</p> <p>d . Please refer to response "c" above.</p> <p>e . Operational considerations for each airport were considered when developing activity forecasts.</p> <p>f . The 12 MAP/125,000 operations constraint at Ontario Airport is not an absolute constraint. The Los Angeles World Airports can obtain an air quality permit from the State Air Resources Board to exceed these levels by submitting an acceptable air quality mitigation plan.</p> <p>g . Please refer to response "c" above.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>the Rocky Mountains.</p> <p>f. Ontario Airport is limited from expanding due to air quality limitations.</p> <p>g. Ontario Airport operates under a waiver from CALTRANS because thousands of homes within the PIL do not yet have insulation to meet the Federal and California State noise standards.</p> <p>h. Takeoffs from Ontario interrupt the normal flow of traffic on approach to LAX.</p> <p>i. San Bernardino Airport is more than an hour's drive from Orange County even with no traffic on the I-91 freeway.</p> <p>j. San Bernardino Airport is located in a "box" canyon requiring approaches from the southwest and departures to the southwest into the approaching traffic ... unacceptable except in clear weather with light traffic.</p> <p>k. Assumptions are made that a high speed rail will send passengers to airports outside Orange County. This is an assumption that cannot be backed up with sound financial data.</p> <p>l. The Federal Government is bleeding red ink, and if the Bond Measure 57 does not pass this March 2004 election - the State of California's finances are also severely curtailed.</p> <p>m. In other words, there is no money for a high speed rail project - not now - and not in the foreseeable future.</p> <p>n. El Toro Airport should be reinstated into the planning process. El Toro is a perfect location for a wealthy area that demands, and can afford air travel.</p> <p>o. Congressman Cox and wealthy developers should</p>	<p>h . Please refer to response "e" above.</p> <p>i . Comment noted</p> <p>j . Please refer to response "e" above.</p> <p>k . All four studies concluded that the Maglev system is financially, operationally and constructively feasible. Furthermore, the feasibility studies for the four corridors demonstrate that the Maglev system can be constructed through a public-private partnership structure administered through a public agency, a joint powers authority (JPA), or a public non-profit (PNP) format using a number of innovative and traditional funding mechanisms. The construction of the system would be financed through tax-exempt bonds and Federal Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovative Act (TIFIA) program loans that would be repaid through project-generated revenues. No operating subsidies would be required. SCAG is currently working to secure federal pre-deployment funding as part of the Re-Authorization of the Transportation Equity Act to complete preliminary engineering for the Federal Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and the State Environmental Impact Report (EIR).</p> <p>l . Comment noted</p> <p>m. Please refer to response "k" above.</p> <p>n. The establishment of a specific site for airport development is a local issue beyond the purview of SCAG</p> <p>o. Comment noted.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
 (Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				not be able to remove El Toro from the 2004 RTP process because of their power, money and influence by threatening to remove \$1,500,000. of Federal Transportation Funds to SCAG - so that the 14,000 acre buffer surrounding El Toro can be developed with homes, and commercial developments. El Toro property belongs to the Federal taxpayers and belongs in the Federal Transportation System.	
RTP-04-136	2/8/2004	Griffin, Charles		<p>The following are my comments concerning the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan. ...</p> <p>It is intuitively obvious that the 2004 SCAG Regional Transportation Plan is without merit and a mockery of its intended function of providing a workable plan for the purpose of obtaining federal funds for needed improvements to interstate highways in California. It is an insult to the intellect of the public to expect the travelers to drive to a mag-lev train station, pay to park the car, manually transport their luggage from the car to the station, pay for a train ticket, manually stow the luggage, ride the train with large intimidating strangers in an uncontrollable, insecure, uncomfortable environment, (often with children or wheel-chair) transfer with heavy luggage from the train to the airline terminal to check the luggage, obtain a boarding pass, go through security, proceed with carry-on luggage to the aircraft gate, wait to be cleared to board and ride the aircraft with large intimidating strangers in an uncontrollable, uncomfortable environment, (often with children)... and then repeat a similar process when returning home. A mag-lev train will be prohibitively expensive to obtain right-of-way, build, ride and maintain. Even today the traveling public wastes approximately one billion dollars annually for roughly ten million passengers to travel between Orange County and LAX or ONT airports on clogged freeways. Conversely it is utter nonsense for SCAG to accept an FAA grant to update the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) with a requirement to eliminate the obvious logical use of the closed MCAS El Toro as a commercial airport as was included in the previous SCAG RTP. The closed MCAS El Toro</p>	Comments noted.

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
 (Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>property should be condemned as right-of-way for a commercial airport for the same reason right-of-way would be condemned for a mag-lev train or interstate freeway. It is obvious that a commercial airport at El Toro per http://www.ocxeltoro.com would provide efficient, convenient air-transportation to more than twenty million annual passengers in Orange County with its existing 12,000 feet long north-south oriented runways providing non-stop service to literally all the major cities in the world (except for south Africa) using the B-7E7 aircraft presently being designed by Boeing per http://www.boeing.com but it can't do it without long runways and unobstructed departure/arrival corridors over preserved compatible land-use as exists at the closed MCAS El Toro. The travelers expect to be driven by a friend, family member of taxi to a convenient airport at El Toro, transfer with heavy luggage to the airline terminal to check the luggage, obtain a boarding pass, go through security, proceed with carry-on luggage to the aircraft gate, wait to be cleared to board and ride the aircraft with large intimidating strangers in an uncontrollable, uncomfortable environment, (often with children)...nonstop (without transfers) to their destination and then repeat a similar process when returning home... and without taking a train! However, passengers doing business in the Los Angeles civic center or Hollywood area would have existing covenant ground transportation by subway to the Union Station and connecting Metrolink train service directly to the passenger terminal at the proposed commercial airport at El Toro.</p> <p>Charles Griffin; bio available at http://www.ocxeltoro.com President, The New Millennium Group Professional Control System Engineer, License CS 4092 732 Bison Ave. Newport Beach, CA 92660-3207 Phone: 949-759-3589</p>	

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
 (Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-137	2/8/2004	Shates, Tim		<p>I believe the Regional Transportation Plan should do everything it can to get people out of their cars and into public transit, particularly rail systems. I live in Ventura County, and I was disappointed at the lack of a future plan for high speed rail along the 101 corridor. There is a significant need for comfortable, high speed rail connecting Los Angeles to Santa Barbara, Santa Maria, Pismo Beach, San Luis Obispo, and points beyond.</p> <p>Metrolink is underutilized, in my opinion. More frequent service, operating seven days a week, is essential. The use of public transportation is a habit-one that Southern Californians have not yet developed. Much of the weekend traffic could be alleviated if alternate forms of transportation were available. I lived in the San Francisco Bay area four years and enjoyed using BART whenever I could. I have used Metrolink to go to downtown Los Angeles, but I had to drive to Moorpark to catch the train at a reasonable hour. I often drive to Los Angeles on weekends because I have no choice. The schedules are not very good. Ideally, Metrolink would run seven days a week, every two hours from 6:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m., more frequently during peak rush hours. In addition, Metrolink service should be established connecting Ventura to Santa Clarita using the 126 right of way.</p> <p>Please, give more options to those of us who want to get out of our cars!</p>	Comment noted.

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
 (Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-138	2/8/2004	Striegl, Anton		I am a Long Beach resident and I want to weigh-in on the regional planning for air traffic in Southern California, or lack thereof. I believe that more must be done in the way of REAL regional planning that also includes funds to build such things as "proposed" high-speed trains. Ontario and Palmdale will never be used by OC travelers without a convenient and cost effective way to get there, as long as they can drive up the 405 to Long Beach. The fact is that Long Beach was never designed to have commercial aircraft taking off hundreds of feet from beautiful residential homes and neighborhood schools. Any suggestion that Long Beach should take more load is ludicrous! I just returned from Germany flew in and out of many cities. None of the airports in Germany were even remotely near homes. We need to work to preserve the quality of life of all Californians and that means that Long Beach cannot be forced to take more commercial flights, period! Orange County is dumping its problems on the less wealthy citizens of Long Beach. Orange County is growing faster than LA county, yet they have been allowed to kill an airport at El Toro. Well, if nobody is going to force OC to take care of their own house, Long Beach should not have to suffer from a failure of real regional planning. You find a way to fix it without hurting the citizens of LA county, which already bears a much larger burden the OC.	Comment duly noted.

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-139	2/9/2004	Chang, Robert		<p>Unfortunately, the SCAG RTP did not go into more depth on Maglev. Maglev is a project that is extremely questionable in this current fiscal and political environment. How much of the improvement in performance measures in this RTP is dependent on Maglev? Or is Maglev merely a "black box" to meet federal conformity guidelines?</p> <p>Finally, I must comment on the public outreach process. This year's RTP outreach was weaker than previous years. In 1998, SCAG embarked on a battery of public outreach, including numerous hearings throughout the region, spaced at different times of the day and week, that incorporated significant public comment. This was not the case in this go around, and indeed SCAG's public outreach seems to have gone down every cycle since then. The only formal RTP public hearing was held during the day on a Thursday, a time that precludes many people from attending. While it is commendable that SCAG conducted outreach to many organizations, I was not aware of a single public meeting specifically for the public, aside from the mid-day official hearing, in Central Los Angeles, the Gateway Cities, the San Gabriel Valley, Antelope Valley, or Orange County, to comment on the RTP. There were meetings in San Bernardino, Riverside, Victorville, Ventura County, and the San Fernando Valley, but none in the core of the SCAG region. The COMPASS project is not a substitute for public meetings on the RTP itself, as COMPASS presentations did not allow the public to provide comments, and the visioning sessions were geared to programs that are not included in this year's RTP. Public outreach needs to improve significantly for the next RTP.</p>	<p>Regarding Maglev, three different consultants conducted feasibility studies including detailed ridership analysis. All studies indicate high daily ridership of at least 500,000 daily trips on the Maglev system. This ridership will relieve congestion on the freeway system, reduce air pollution and provide better job access. These features have improved the performance measures of the RTP.</p> <p>SCAG was involved in over 200 public outreach efforts for the RTP. In addition to the formal public hearing, SCAG held a series of ten public workshops around the region, including at least one in each county and two in Los Angeles County. Each of these workshops was an opportunity for public input into the RTP, as were the other approximately 200 outreach presentations held around the region. SCAG's resources for outreach are limited, but we appreciate your suggestions as to how to improve our efforts for the next RTP cycle.</p>
RTP-04-140	2/9/2004	Bacharach, Jacki	South Bay Cities Council of Governments	<p>1. Concern that funding from new sources that don't presently exist could jeopardize the integrity of the plan.</p> <p>2. No discussion of operating improvements needed or non-system expansion investments. Aging infrastructure also not properly addressed.</p> <p>3. More attention paid to arterial improvements.</p>	<p>1. Certainly, SCAG recognizes that there are significant challenges associated with the financial strategies proposed in the Draft 2004 RTP. Nevertheless, these initiatives, including the sales tax extension proposal and the public private partnership initiatives attempt to highlight some of the revenue enhancement opportunities that are likely to be implemented over the long term (within the timeframe of the RTP – through 2030). SCAG welcomes further input in exploring these and other viable near and long-term transportation funding solutions.</p> <p>2. Operational improvements and other non-expansion type of</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>4. Bus service and funding needs to be better addressed.</p> <p>5. Not convinced MAGLEV will have the asserted mobility benefits.</p> <p>6. The attached project list assigns project priorities for South Bay.</p> <p>7. Supports Green Line extension to South Bay Galleria.</p> <p>8. Need a better analysis on trucks, trains and port operations.</p> <p>9. SCAG needs to be forthcoming about LCV's and move the discussion to the main document.</p> <p>10. SCAG needs better coordination with the air districts to correlate responsible agencies and penalties.</p> <p>11. Inaccuracies on COMPASS maps, cannot support their use in the RTP.</p>	<p>investments (including preservation) are discussed in the RTP. In fact, preservation is funded an additional \$6.6 billion and Operations an additional \$1 billion over and above the Baseline fund estimated. SCAG agrees that preservation and operations are critical in a maturing and aging system. As such, it has made system management as one of its central tenets in the 2004 RTP.</p> <p>3. The 2004 RTP acknowledges the importance of the Arterial system and</p> <p>4. Comment noted.</p> <p>5. Comment noted.</p> <p>6. Proposed projects that are not already in the constrained portion of the plan will be included in the unconstrained portion of the plan so that they can be considered for inclusion in the future amendments or updates of the RTP as funding scenario changes.</p> <p>7. Green Line extension to South Bay Galleria is currently in the unconstrained portion of the plan. Should funding availability for light rail projects change, this project would be a prime candidate for consideration.</p> <p>8. Comment noted.</p> <p>9. comment noted. SCAG recognizes that decisions on LCV is still premature and that additional studies and consensus building will be needed prior to reaching a decision.</p> <p>10. Comment noted.</p> <p>11. Comment noted. Corrections to the maps will be considered for the Final RTP to the extent feasible within the constraints of available time.</p>
RTP-04-141	2/9/2004	Cooper, Brent	City of Lake Forest	1. City of Lake Forest concurs with OCTA comments.	See responses to OCTA.

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
 (Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-142	2/9/2004	Nyre, Donald		<p>This is to comment on a proposed 2004 Southern California Association of Governments Regional Transportation Plan which is based on a "Preferred Regional Aviation Plan," memorandum, dated September 17, 2003. The plan outlined in the memorandum can not work and will not work, and SCAG must set aside politics and come up with a plan based on capacity of closed and proposed airports, and not pander to developers trying to kill airports.</p> <p>The planned El Toro International Airport has been removed from SCAG's plan based on one simple Orange County vote and a political grant from the FAA, which can be corrected at the drop of a hat. This is representative planning at its worst, and SCAG must not succumb to such politics. After the developers have been dispatched, El Toro is ready for take off. SCAG members want El Toro in the plan as evidenced by the previous plan containing El Toro adopted 65 to 2. I doubt if they will accept a plan without El Toro. Without El Toro the plan looks ridiculous. Staff must listen to its members and not FAA grants or Orange County politicians fronting for developers with a 3:2 vote. The capacity of El Toro is well known. It can handle 30 million annual passengers. It has no one in the noise zone. It has freeways on three sides and does not require any futuristic magnetic levitation transit system for access. It must be put back into SCAG's plan in order to give it any credibility. The allocations made in the memorandum dated September 17, 2003, depend totally on the implementation of a magnetic levitation rail line to carry passengers from the developed coast to the remote areas of Victorville, Palmdale, March Air Force Base, and San Bernardino. The demand does not exist out there.</p> <p>Magnetic levitation projects in Germany and Asia are being abandoned as impractical to continue. They make too much noise. It's like an airplane roaring along without wings at twice take off speed or more. Even when they work, they have to be heavily subsidized. Such systems will not be available in the foreseeable future here, and any demands out in the</p>	<p>Comment on aviation issue is duly noted.</p> <p>Germany's Maglev project has been in operation for the past two decades, and Shanghai has been commercially operating since 2003. Both programs have been exceedingly successful. Furthermore, Maglev is much quieter than other transportation systems as it does not produce any rolling, gearing or engine noise. Noise, predominantly aerodynamic, is minimal at speeds up to 155 mph and is significantly less than conventional steel-on-steel trains at higher speeds. Maglev is the quietest high-speed ground transportation system available today. Germany is currently studying a Maglev technology deployment in Munich. Four independent feasibility studies were conducted on the Southern California Maglev system. The feasibility studies for the four corridors demonstrate that the Maglev system can be constructed through a public-private partnership structure administered through a public agency, a joint powers authority (JPA), or a public non-profit (PNP) format using a number of innovative and traditional funding mechanisms. No public subsidy would be required.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
 (Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>sticks should be allocated based on just that, nothing, or very little. Magnetic levitation does not meet the needs. Even with magnetic levitation to outlying airports, there is a shortfall of 22 million annual passengers in the forecast numbers. The demand at 2030 is 192 million annual passengers. With allocations based on magical magnetic levitation of 170 million annual passengers, there is a shortfall of 22 million annual passengers. Without magnetic levitation, a more practical allocation of 154 million annual passengers, compared to 192 annual passengers demand, gives a shortfall of 38 million annual passengers. There is no solution to this shortfall dilemma of 22 million annual passengers or 38 million annual passengers. The answer is to include El Toro in the tables, over the objections of the developers and the FAA, and wait for that airport to be opened. It has two 10,000 foot runways and two 8,000 foot runways, and all we have to do is turn on the lights. Planning is a long term commitment. The local politics of El Toro can easily be overruled by the region, when the region makes up its mind to do so. Thank god we have such a fine airport just waiting to be used in Orange County where demand has outstripped supply for decades. There is no other answer.</p> <p>Donald Nyre 231 Santa Ana Avenue Newport Beach, CA 92663 (949) 646-5369</p>	

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
 (Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-143	2/9/2004	Butcher, Everett		<p>1. The Town of Apple Valley has reviewed the subject document and concurs with the DRTP's general approach and treatment of a very complex subject and with the expressed goals of the DRTP.</p> <p>2. ..has also reviewed the general policy points that will underlie expected DRTP comments from the San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG). We agree with these comments, especially the calls for inclusion of additional information, clarification, schedules, financing options and analyses, decision rationales and inter-agency coordination.</p> <p>3. Pg. 10 of the DRTP contains a comment about SANBAG "considering the feasibility of a development mitigation fee associated with...Measure I renewal..." We feel that such a fee is not necessarily "associated" with Measure I renewal and discussion here about such a fee should not make such a strong connection with Measure I renewal.</p>	<p>1. Comment noted.</p> <p>2. Comment noted.</p> <p>3. Comments regarding the linkage between mitigation fees and Measure I are noted. It should be clarified that there are several development mitigation fee implementation options currently being examined.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-144	2/9/2004	Hossan, Carole		<p>Subject: SCAG Draft 2004 RTP Dest. 2030 comments</p> <p>Addendum to previously submitted comments: BASELINE LOS ANGELES COUNTY LOCAL HIGHWAYS: PROJECT ID: LA996390 SEPULVEDA BLVD. FROM CENTINELA AVE. TO LINCOLN BLVD - WIDEN SEPUL BLVD. BET. LINCOLN AND CENTINELA TO PROVIDE BUS/CARPOOL PRIORITY LANE.</p> <p>I would like a reply to the current status of this (the above) project. Thank you, Carole Hossan merryrun@mindspring.com 7725 Hindry Avenue Los Angeles CA 90045-3225 February 9, 2004</p> <p>Dear SCAG,</p> <p>I submitted comments against the Arbor Vitae Interchange project I believe in the 2002 SCAG RTP - I would echo those comments. I assume you have them on file; please attach that letter to these comments. In general, this interchange would facilitate traffic into LAX; currently the only constraint on growth at LAX are current roads' capability for handling it.</p> <p>First, in a general comment, I do not support any road project that facilitates the growth of LAX in physical size or in increasing LAX's capacity. SCAG should promote and facilitate the regionalization of our air traffic system, as concentrating everything at LAX makes LAX an even larger, more attractive magnet for those who would wish to disrupt our Southern California economy and injure people. El Toro Airport should be brought back into play as a matter of national security!</p> <p>I also oppose any widening of La Tijera Boulevard in Westchester (90045). It is quite wide at present . . . it must not become another funnel for LAX traffic.</p> <p>Sincerely, Carole Hossan 7725 Hindry Avenue Westchester California 90045-3225 merryrun@mindspring.com</p>	<p>Arbor Vitae Interchange Improvement project was established as a project that would be vital in relieving congestion along the I-405 Corridor whether or not LAX expansion is implemented. The inclusion of this project in the RTP was based on collaborative and cooperative planning process involving SCAG and the stakeholders, including Caltrans, LACMTA, and the City of Inglewood.</p>
RTP-04-145	2/9/2004	Wallerstein, Barry R.	South Coast Air Quality Mgmt Dist	<p>1. Population Growth: "We believe a closer look and continuing scrutiny of demographic growth assumptions is critical to determine how to accommodate such growth, not only in terms of</p>	<p>1. The single most important objective of SCAG growth forecast is to provide likely long-term growth outlook that regional planning agencies can plan the region for a better tomorrow. Throughout the 2004 RTP growth forecast process, SCAG works closely with all stakeholders and</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>meeting the transportation demand, but also with achieving air quality goals. More emphasis must be placed on minimizing the emissions from all transportation sectors while accommodating growth. Committed to working w/SCG to ensure that air quality impacts are properly addressed and air quality benefits are optimally realized.</p> <p>2. Air Quality Benefits...concerned that the DRTP does not show transparency for determining the air quality impacts associated with proposed transportation projects; little emphasis is placed on evaluating the Plan's performance with respect to air quality benefits. The Plan should provide sufficient technical details in deriving the air quality benefits. ...in addition to demonstrating compliance with the Conformity requirements, the Plan should also strive to identify and compare scenarios having a different mix of plausible strategies which would yield greater air quality benefits than those needed for Conformity. We recommend that SCAG enhance its environmental performance criteria by analyzing the potential air quality impacts of difference land-use/transportation scenarios and groups of transportation-related projects assumed in the DRTP (e.g. with and without MAGLEV, different distribution of airport MAPs etc.) to demonstrate how these variations would impact air quality.</p> <p>3. Emission Reduction Commitment- The underlying assumptions in DRTP is that reductions associated with the TCMs and transportation/landuse projects will occur. In order to ensure that these reductions are realized, the DRTP must include backstop strategies in the event the proposed projects or measures are not implemented. We recommend that SCAG develop sufficient backstops by working with local government and project proponents to ensure that the overall emission reduction commitments are met. SCAG should also strive to achieve more reductions through proper RTP design.</p> <p>4. Growth Forecasts - Suggest that the DRTP include discussion of specific areas of uncertainties</p>	<p>all southern California local jurisdictions to reach the current forecasts. This collaborative process in reaching the growth forecasts for the region will continue in the future.</p> <p>The growth vision/land use strategies is a key and innovative policy component in SCAG's 2004 RTP growth forecast. The purpose is consistent with what the comment suggested that the region is not just accommodating growth, the region is moving into the strategies as how to best accommodate the growth such that many quality of life criteria, including air quality, can be "optimized or maximized."</p> <p>2. Re. Air Quality Performance Indicators. SCAG concurs with the observation that the air quality impacts of regional transportation planning are significant, and merit attention. These are discussed in more detail in the 2004 RTP PEIR. It should be noted that the RTP marks one, albeit a significant, step in an on-going process and regional dialogue. SCAG is working actively to involve the various sub-regions and local jurisdictions into a discussion of innovative ways in which to better integrate and account for air quality and environmental effects of land use planning practices and land cover management strategies. In addition, please note that no emission reduction credits have been claimed, either for land-use measures or for the MagLev system, in the 2004 RTP conformity determination process. The implementation of both these elements is projected subsequent to the Air Basin's designated attainment year of 2010.</p> <p>3. Re. Emission Reduction - recommendation for backstop strategies in case TCMs and transportation projects and measures are not successfully implemented. The triennial RTP is the culmination of a complex process by which transportation projects are proposed by local jurisdictions, their funding mechanisms delineated, and their defensibility tested. One significant formative process for the RTP is the biennial development of a Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), which specifies and commits the funding needed to underwrite projects that have been proposed and extensively reviewed at the local and sub-regional level. The RTIP has a time horizon of six years, with the projects listed for implementation in its first two years being fiscally constrained. SCAG is required to ensure that all Transportation Control Measure projects are fully funded and completed in a timely manner, except in cases where a formal substitution is proposed. A more detailed discussion of this process used to assure implementation certainty, and developed on the basis of extensive inter-agency consultation, can be found in the 2003 Air Quality Management Plan/State Implementation Plan. Given this robust and well-tested process by which a project comes to be included in any RTP, with its</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>associated with growth projections (e.g. port activities, air travel, and truck trips) due to potential uncertainties inherent in forecast methodologies as well as due to implementation, legislation, and funding issues.</p> <p>5. Land Use/Transp Planing - "Since SCAG does not have the authority to control land use, local jurisdiction will be responsible for implementing the proposed land-use strategies, such as the concept of "in-fill" and the development of job-rich areas near transportation hubs. We suggest that the Plan highlight these common issues with respect to achieving the proposed land-use objectives and proposed specific process to work with local governments as well as state and local agencies to develop consensus in crafting and implementing such strategies.</p> <p>6. Funding Sources - Strong disagree with SCAG's proposal to consider charging fees for alternative-fuel vehicles since such actions would adversely impact timely penetration and commercialization of these low-emitting vehicles into the region as necessary for achieving air quality objectives, which in turn may jeopardize future Conformity findings and the vitally important in flow of federal funds into the Basine. We also stress that add'l funding should be sought from the federal government for implementing these strategies.</p> <p>7. Aviation Strategy/Maglev - Concerned that there is currently no consensus, process, or timeline for the decentralization assumed in the Preferred Aviation Plan. We strongly suggest that the DRTP also consider and incorporate feasible alternatives to the MAGLEV system into the Preferred Aviation Plan with equivalent air quality benefits in the event that this system does not materialize.</p> <p>8. Transp. Project Mitigation Measures - It is imperative for the DRTP to address and incorporate mitigation measures for these projects (freeway enhancements, toll roads) to minimize PM10</p>	<p>multi-level and inter-agency checks and balances, and given, further, the clearly mandated Federal requirement for the timely and assured implementation of all designated TCM projects, as well as the formalized process for TCM substitution, SCAG believes that an independent back-stop process, apart from the RTIP, would consume agency resources that are perhaps better applied elsewhere.</p> <p>As noted above, SCAG is not taking any emission reduction credit for land use measures prior to the attainment year of 2010. SCAG is particularly committed to exploring the linkages between alternative land use patterns and their environmental consequences. Southern California Compass <http://www.socalcompass.org/> is the growth visioning process that has recently been initiated, to facilitate dialogue across stakeholder groups and to explore promising and innovative local land use practices with potentially regional environmental benefits.</p> <p>4. The forecasting uncertainties, including those (aviation, VMT, truck trips, etc.) derived from the basic growth forecast of population, household and employment are discussed at a much earlier planning and model development stage. Whatever had shown in the Draft RTP is a set of "fixed" figures without any uncertainties. In this RTP, SCAG deals "uncertainties" explicitly through following modeling exercises: (1) Run growth forecast with and without land use strategies, (2) Run growth forecast with and without higher growth of employment and household due to likely plan implementation, and (3) Run three different aviation scenarios: preferred plan (highest projected MAP), preferred plan without Maglev, and constrained scenario (lowest MAP).</p> <p>5. The draft RTP contains substantial discussion of implementation actions necessary for SCAG, transportation commissions, and local governments, of note in Chapter 6 (pages 149-152). Further, SCAG will develop a refined implementation program based on continued dialogue beyond the adoption of this RTP.</p> <p>6. Re. Lack of Permanent or Reliable Funding Sources - Comments regarding opposition to taxing alternative fuels and overall funding uncertainties are noted. SCAG looks forward to working with its stakeholders, the State, and the SCAQMD to secure additional federal funding for the Region.</p> <p>7. The process and timeline for implementing the Preferred Aviation Plan will be specified in more detail through SCAG's continuing planning process over the next year, in the development of a Regional Aviation Implementation Plan. The Preferred Aviation Plan will generate more emissions than the constrained (No Project) aviation alternative,</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>emissions. We recommend that the DRTP incorporate all feasible dust control strategies for the construction and operational phases of transportation projects with significant PM10 impacts.</p> <p>9. Environmental Justice - " There are instances where localized impacts from transportation-related projects or development zones assumed in the Plan could create potential emission "hot spots" that could disproportionately and adversely affect various income, ethnic, or age groups. The DRTP does not address these potential hot spots except to say that the analysis did not show any disproportionate impact. We suggest that the evaluation of "hot spot" areas and the environmental justice discussion in general, present a substantially more thorough and transparent assessment, so that a clearer picture of the community and neighborhood level environmental justice impacts emerges for public comment.</p> <p>10. Plan Implementation - Recommend that the 2004 RTP explicitly identify actions and timeframes needed in overcoming (these) barriers (see comment letter), and thoroughly address the potential impacts of the Plan if necessary pieces do not fall into place, and present a number of "what if" scenarios for public comment.</p>	<p>because it serves about 29 million more air passengers, mainly because of Maglev access to suburban airports. Recommendation to include feasible alternatives to the Maglev into the Preferred Aviation Plan noted.</p> <p>8. The re-entrained fugitive road dust component of PM10 emissions due to the construction and operation of facilities within the region is undoubtedly a matter of significant concern, and the PEIR so stipulates. All feasible and available control measures to mitigate construction-related PM10 emissions are expected to be applied at the project level. In addition the various measures stipulated by the SCAQMD in the 2003 AQMP/SIP are incorporated by reference, in the PEIR. Traffic-related operational road dust, however, is partly a function of vehicle miles traveled (VMT), and will continue to pose a serious challenge to the region. VMT will continue to increase into the future, so long as there is socio-economic growth, and so PM-related standards and strategies will have to be molded around this reality of increasing PM emissions.</p> <p>9. Subsequent analysis has been conducted focused on only those Transportation Analysis Zones where emissions will increase under the 2004 RTP. The distribution of population in these areas is approximately the same for all income and ethnic groups, indicating that there is no disproportionate impact even in these areas (see Technical Appendix G). SCAG appreciates the recommendation that the analysis examine air quality "hot spots" and will seek ways to incorporate this into our future work.</p> <p>10. SCAG recognizes there are significant challenges in implementing innovative components of the plan. SCAG anticipates working with the stakeholders on an on-going basis beyond the adoption of the plan in further refining and building consensus on many of these strategies.</p>
RTP-04-146	2/9/2004	Casey, Rose	Caltrans District 7, 8, 11 & 12	<p>"Wish to commend SCAG for many laudable elements that appear in the Draft RTP. The Dept. supports many of the Draft RTP approaches, identifications of key issues and recommendations." The following comments are focused towards improvement:</p> <p>1. With projected doubling of truck traffic by 2030, the feasibility of Exclusive truck lanes (similar to HOV lanes) should be considered in future studies.</p> <p>2. Because the Pacific Surfer service provides an important element of mobility within the SCAG region, we request there be a discussion of inter-city</p>	<p>1. SCAG concurs. Future studies of exclusive truck lanes are a priority for SCAG as well.</p> <p>2. Comment noted. A brief discussion of Inter-city rail will be considered for the final RTP.</p> <p>3. PILUT I and PILUT II are discussed on page 2, and pages 20-21 of the Draft RTP. It should be noted that these scenarios were preliminary and are described as background for the Draft RTP as presented.</p> <p>4. Comment noted regarding need to periodically examine funding projections of City, County, State and Federal transportation funding.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>rail service.</p> <p>3. ...with its focus on improvement and expansion of infrastructure outside the urban centers, PILUT 2 is a more favorable alternative for outlying areas.</p> <p>4. City, county, state and federal transportation funding projections should be examined periodically to determine and adjust the feasibility of the Capital Investment Plan, Program and Implementation (CTP).</p> <p>5. We note continuing major developments of linkages in the LA County transit network...We caution, however, that performance measurement and forecast modeling should be reviewed for consistency, particularly in assumptions on ridership and effects on other modes of transportation. Identified needed improvements should be implemented and corrections made in the ATP.</p> <p>Specific Comments:</p> <p>6. The approved March 2003 PSR/PDS for I-5 between SR 14 and ST 126 should be mentioned. Recommend that SCAG RTP include reference to the 2002 Imperial Co. Transportation Plan in discussion of highway projects, to allow consideration of other potential near-,mid-, and long-term projects.</p> <p>7. Emission budget comparison numbers for South Coast and Coachella Valley areas need to be revised to reflect boundary changes. (see comment letter, pg. 3 last paragraph).</p> <p>8. rapid growth expected in the High Desert area, especially north of San Bernardino. By all growth projections, this is the next growth "ring" in So. Cal over the next 25 yrs and will impact mobility and development in the Santa Clarita-Palmdale-Victorville areas. ...believe that this ongoing development trend and its implications should be more strongly discussed in the RTP.</p>	<p>5. Comment noted regarding consistency between performance measurement and modeling forecast.</p> <p>6. Improvement on I-5 between SR-14 and SR-126 is currently in the unconstrained portion of the plan. As for the Imperial County Transportation Plan, it served as a direct input to the 2004 RTP and is referenced in the Technical Appendix.</p> <p>7. The new emissions budgets as well as the SCAG regional emissions analysis were based on the new boundaries for South Coast and Coachella Valley areas. This was done in consultation with the federal agencies (EPA, FHWA, and FTA) prior to EPA's formal action on the boundary changes.</p> <p>8. The comment regarding rapid growth in high desert areas is duly noted. The land use measures in the Draft RTP do not broadly reallocate growth around the region compared to the no project alternative. As such, growth in the high desert is assumed. Providing for the transportation needs in newly emerging, high growth areas remains a priority for SCAG.</p> <p>9. Efficiencies that may be realized through a higher utilization of existing facilities are a priority for future study. Community impact assessments and mitigation measures would be part of any future MIS studies.</p> <p>10 a) Comment noted. Appropriate correction will be incorporated in the Final RTP.</p> <p>10 b) Comments regarding State mandatory requirements identified in the CTC guidelines are noted. Edits to the RTP will aim to clearly identify the sections that address the Policy Element, the Action Element, and the Financial Element.</p> <p>10 c) The 2004 RTP provides information on the investment levels (uses of all identified revenues) by modal category and timeframe throughout the draft text.</p> <p>10 d) Additional language will be added to reflect outreach to Tribal Governments</p> <p>11. Data and assumption contributing to the growth forecast are described in the Technical Appendix to the RTP.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>9. Improvement Goods Movement Structure - current GM infrastructure (specifically rail) has not been maximized. This issue needs to be more strongly identified in the RTP as a critical part of GM in So. Cal. that should be addressed. GM section would be stronger if it included a brief overview of current and future trends in GM....Need to look at community impacts of goods movement and address them early in planning process...The SCAG Region Truck Travel Trend numbers should be articulated beyond just the bar graph. (see comment letter for add'l general comments on goods movement)</p> <p>10. Overview of State and Federal Requirements a) "it is said the first four years of the plans must be consistent with the four-year STIP. Should this read a "five-year STIP" program? b) Suggest that the RTP text include specific reference to the title of the Appendix and page numbers, when add'l info. that augments the RTP chapters is located in an appendix. c) ..though it is not expected that the RTP section note all required state and federal legislation/regulation, there are some requirements that the RTP does not appear to address. (see comment letter, pg. 6 for list of requirements) RTP does not contain either a short-term (10 yr.) or long term (20 yr horizon) as required. There is neither discussion nor methods utilized to explain and show how the \$120 billion identified as needed for the plan period will be applied in the specified time frames. d) Encourages SCAG to include in the RTP a discussion regarding tribal governments consultation, any concerns the Tribes requested be addressed in the RTP and further consultation efforts which will be undertaken in the future.</p> <p>11. Socioeconomic - For each of the following four area listed in Riverside Co., we request specifications in the Plan document, of whatever assumptions or documentation SCAG used to support the data: (This is regarding following page</p>	<p>12. A revision to the proposed final RTP as suggested will be considered.</p> <p>13. Comment noted. The list of stake holders identified in the plan is for illustrative purpose and not intended to depict an exhaustive list of all the stake holders.</p> <p>14. Comment noted. Revisions will be incorporated in the Final RTP.</p> <p>15. Comment noted.</p> <p>16. Goods Movement strategies address all modes—air, sea, rail, road—and include corridor capacity enhancements, grade separations, truck climbing lanes, ground access, and etc</p> <p>17. Comment noted. Given the size and scale of the region, it is a challenge to depict every regional parameter meaningfully in the same scale as that of the Exhibit 1.1.</p> <p>18. Comment concerning page 16 (Riverside County Measure A) has been noted and modified for further clarification.</p> <p>19. High Desert Corridor as a whole is included in the list of Post 2030 Long Range Corridors. Improvements on SR-138 and I-18, which are elements of the proposed High Desert Corridor, are already included in the constrained plan.</p> <p>20. The land use measures included in the Draft RTP are the result of a process of examining alternative scenarios as described on page 20. It should be noted that SCAG's efforts in planning for growth will continue beyond this RTP and will be reflected in future RTPs.</p> <p>21. Comment noted.</p> <p>22. Prior to the adoption of this RTP, SCAG will secure commitments from local governments to pursue interim actions in support of the land use measures in the plan.</p> <p>23. Tribal concerns relative to transportation needs are important to SCAG and accordingly made significant progress in outreaching the tribal communities and involving them in the regional transportation process. Several workshops have been organized and SCAG is working with the tribal communities to seek grant funding to study their transportation needs and develop transportation plans. The fruits of this</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>36, Exhibit 2.3, entitled "Population Increase 2000-2030) (see comment letter, pg 7 for list) Specific RTP Page Comments</p> <p>12. Executive Summary pg. 1&2 - recommend that COMPASS reference be defined.</p> <p>13. Pg. 2 - recommend enlarging a List of Stakeholders in the development of RTP (pg. 29) to include underrepresented groups as stakeholders.</p> <p>14. Page 3 & 44, Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach are the USA;s two largest ports, not 2nd and 3rd largest.</p> <p>15. Pg.7 - .."there should be more substantial identification of the importance of "land use and transportation" connections in the Highways and Arterials section.</p> <p>16. pg. 8, 48, Goods Movement - are these the only two "strategies" dealing with freight in SCAG's region? The growth forecast listed in the opening paragraph should be more narrowly defined.</p> <p>17. We recommend using of the Base map shown in Exhibit 1.1 for all other maps throughout the plan for this included Imperial County.</p> <p>18. Pg 16 Riv. Co.Measure A - The two paragraphs need to be checked for consistency.</p> <p>19.Pg.17 Plan Implementation-Under regionally significant special studies list, please include the High Desert Corridor Study.</p> <p>20. Potential Growth Patterns - We recommend considering the importance of alternative growth scenarios--like growth in and around existing, established communities--to contribute toward reversing these socio-economic trends.</p> <p>21. ...it should be noted that the So.Calf. region HAS moved forward with seaport expansions, with</p>	<p>process will be reflected more fully in the next plan update.</p> <p>24. SCAG remains committed to provision of affordable housing as needed around the region. Comment is duly noted.</p> <p>25. Comment noted.</p> <p>26. The Draft RTP (page 43) states "Non-motorized transportation, by its very nature, would be more effective at a local level in communities that are densely populated and have a good mix of land uses, including commercial, residential and institutional." Inclusion of this statement should address the comment.</p> <p>27. Comment noted.</p> <p>28. The Center Line project is included in the Tier2 list of projects.</p> <p>29. Airline cooperation to support the "brokering" concept in the Preferred Aviation Plan is a long-range objective that is not expected to occur within the next 30 months. Current examples of airline cooperation include the increase use code sharing by the passenger carriers. Also, the air cargo industry has seen increased use of shared processing and storage facilities, and interline agreements whereby carriers buy space on other carriers to handle overflow cargo and/or to transport the cargo to further destinations.</p> <p>30. Will be corrected in the Final 2004 RTP.</p> <p>31. The region's airport system is the busiest in terms of total aircraft operations. This will be clarified in the Final 2004 RTP.</p> <p>32. "Commercial service airport" as defined by the FAA is a publicly owned airport that has at least 2,500 passenger boardings each year and receives scheduled passenger services. A "commuter service airport" as defined by the FAA is an airport: 1) That is not served by an air carrier certificate under section 401 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958; (2) That is regularly served by one or more air carriers operating under an exemption granted by the Civil Aeronautics Board from section 401(a) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958; and (3) At which not less than 2,500 passengers were enplaned during the preceding calendar year by air carriers operating under an exemption from section 401(a).</p> <p>33. The physical and legal capacity constraints at urban airports in the region are described in the aviation technical appendices in the Draft</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>development of warehousing in the Inland Empire, and with the conversion of military airports to air cargo/logistics centers.</p> <p>22. Pg. 22, Land use/transportation - ...Plan could include a discussion that shows how the local jurisdictions find the Plan goals and objectives, and particularly action items that would fall to local jurisdictions, to be implementable.</p> <p>23. pg. 29 Public outreach-Other than including the tribal communities in the stakeholders list, there is no mention of the tribal govt concerns in this section.</p> <p>24. Pg. 33- Housing and Households -consider more discussion on affordable housing or strategies needed to correct jobs-to-housing ratio balance. Consider strategies on how to deliver the quantity and diversity of housing needed in the region.</p> <p>25. Pg. 35- recommend consideration that the long-term health of the region may depend more on regional approaches and less on short-term approaches like treating "hot spots".</p> <p>26. Pg 43. - suggest adding a statement that addresses the importance of "high-density, mixed-use development" to promote non-motorized transportation.</p> <p>27. pg. 44 - The analysis should reflect the relationship between transportation demand (VMT) vs. Capacity (lane miles) in lieu of comparing population to capacity.</p> <p>28. Pg. 46 - Transit Subsidies Chart - a more useful char would be a break down by system rather than by county. One of the major transit issues, the Orange County Centerline project is not covered at all.</p> <p>29. pg. 51 - believe that several assumptions on which the Preferred Aviation Plan depends may prove to be formidable challenges. Main concern is</p>	<p>2004 RTP starting on page D-6-19.</p> <p>33b. Comment referencing page 55 has been noted and SCAG also recognizes the importance of renewing local sales tax measures for transportation development.</p> <p>34. Comments noted. System Management strategies discussed in pages 70-73 include: Operational Improvements, Incident Management, Ramp metering, Traveler information systems and others. SCAG will review this section to make that point clear.</p> <p>35. Table 4.1 will be corrected.</p> <p>36. Comment noted.</p> <p>37. Appendix F - Congestion Management System addresses the CMPs in the SCAG region.</p> <p>38. The 2004 RTP does not assume specific land use policy actions by local governments prior to 2010. Nevertheless, SCAG has committed to various interim actions to demonstrate good faith effort and incremental progress in land use implementation, including transit oriented development demonstrations with the MTA of Los Angeles County as well as commitments from individual local governments. The comment is noted, and SCAG will develop further implementation measures in the planning for future RTPs.</p> <p>39. Comment noted.</p> <p>40. Three of the additional projects identified are part of the Baseline and are included in the technical appendix. SCAG may include a list of projects from the Baseline to make that point clear. The new corridors are not part of the fiscally constrained plan, but are listed in the unconstrained portion of the plan.</p> <p>41. Comment noted. A brief discussion of Inter-city rail will be considered for the final RTP.</p> <p>42. Yes, Exposition Light Rail is included in the constrained portion of the 2004 RTP.</p> <p>43. Comment noted.</p> <p>44. Studies of extended hours of gate operations and load scheduling at the ports to realize latent systemic efficiencies are presently underway</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>"Airlines buy-in on the Preferred Aviation Plan". (see comment letter)</p> <p>30. pg. 53, Table 2.5 - seems as if the 1980 total should be 888 instead of 887.</p> <p>31. pg. 53 Paragraph 1 - Does "busiest" mean in terms of passengers, operations, scheduled flights, etc." If so, which, or is it all of them?</p> <p>32. pg. 54 Exhibit 2.7 - The definition of a "commercial airport" and a "commuter airport" are not provided.</p> <p>33. pg.55, para 1 - a footnote defining the term or referring to specific discussions of "legal capacity" would avoid ambiguity and reader confusion.</p> <p>34. pg.70 System Mgmt - focuses mainly on data collection and does not take the opportunity to discuss all the components and strategies of the System Mgmt. Philosophy as depicted in Fig 4.2</p> <p>35. Table 4.1 - State Hwy Regional Total should be \$6.2 billion instead of \$6.0</p> <p>36. pg. 71 Fig. 4.3- (see comment letter)</p> <p>37. pg 73 Cong. Mgmt. - RTP should include the individual and cumulative CMP results for the region.</p> <p>38. Pg. 79-80, Landuse/Transp. - see comment (pg. 12 of comment letter)</p> <p>39. Table 4.4-Consider changing the Table Title from HOV projects to HOV Gap Closure Projects, since this is how it is referred to on the previous page.</p> <p>40. Pg. 87, Mixed Flow Project Table - recommend inclusion of projects from the 2002 Imperial Co. Transportation Plan (see comment letter, pg. 13)</p> <p>41. Why doesn't the DRTP mention inter-city rail service in the SCAG region?</p>	<p>by the ports.</p> <p>45. Comment noted. SCAG will coordinate with Imperial County as appropriate.</p> <p>46. Alameda Corridor Transportation Authority is an exempla of such an authority.</p> <p>47. Location of inland port would be the focus of future studies.</p> <p>48. Palmdale airport will reach 12.8 MAP as LAX nears maximum capacity. The southern California Maglev system has been developed to accommodate the decentralization of the regional airports. The growth of the region will require alternatives to provide for the increase in air passenger demand. Ontario and Palmdale airports will be developed into international airports and will be upgraded to increase air passenger capacity. Without the proposed Maglev system, it is forecast that about 15 million air passengers in the Preferred Aviation Plan would not fly, and demand served would drop to about 155 MAP.</p> <p>49. FAA identifiers for airports are not used since they can be very confusing (e.g., few laypersons know that SNA stands for John Wayne Airport). The abbreviation "SCI" will be changed to "SCL" in the Final 2004 RTP since the name of the former George Air Force Base is now Southern California Logistics Airport.</p> <p>50. As shown in Table 4.16 on page 109 of the Draft 2004 RTP, these cargo percentages are for the Preferred Aviation Plan. As discussion of the RADAM air cargo model and methodology used to generate these percentages, as well as the assumptions used to define the Preferred Aviation Plan, can be found in the aviation technical appendices.</p> <p>51. These terms will be included in the glossary.</p> <p>52. Comment referencing page 113 on recommended funding strategies have been noted. For clarification, SCAG's financial strategies for the 2004 RTP include the renewal of local sales taxes for transportation.</p> <p>53. Comment noted. Appropriate edits for clarification will be incorporated into the final RTP.</p> <p>54. SCAG's environmental justice analysis shows a disproportionate impact of aviation noise on non-white persons in the region. This impact is almost entirely the result of the noise impacts of LAX. However, by 2030 LAX will be at its maximum capacity of 78 MAP (the level called for</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Comm. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>42. Pg. 94 Exh 4.5 - Does the Rail Plan include the Exposition Rail Line which MTA is developing?</p> <p>43. Pg. 96 Good Movement - Roadway improvements to address truck demand could be included and should include State Route 7 and State Route 78/86.</p> <p>44. Pg. 96-103, Goods Movement (Potential Solutions). This section needs a discussion of how current system capacity could be optimized for freight movement, including changes to seaport gate and shipper/receiver pickup and delivery hours.</p> <p>45. Pg. 99, Reg'l Rail Capacity Improvement Program - Please address the re-opening of the San Diego Arizona Eastern railway from San Diego to Imperial.</p> <p>46. Pg. 99-101 - Are there examples in the US where authorities (such as the concept of a So. Calif. Railroad Infrastructure Financing Authority) presently exist?</p> <p>47. pg. 1030 What location does SCAG believe to have the best potential location for an inland port complex? At present, no indication in given in the text.</p> <p>48. MAGLEV - Without such (projected) Plamdale growth, to which airport(s) will some (or all) of the forecast 12.8MAP be allocated and how will they get there?</p> <p>49. Table 4.14 & Table 4.16 need the airport abbreviations defined. (see comment letter, pg. 15)</p> <p>50) Aviation - "other airports in Palmdale and the Inland Empire go from serving no air cargo to serving a combined 44%". Where did this figure come from? Request documentation.</p> <p>51. Pg. 110 Paragraph 2 - terms "robust flight portfolio" and catalytic demand" are define in Appendix D-6 but not in the glossary of this</p>	<p>in the current Master Plan) and SCAG does not have an alternative to choose that would reduce this impact.</p> <p>The preferred aviation plan assumes the airports in urbanized environments (LAX, Burbank, Long Beach, John Wayne and Ontario) to be constrained to their existing legal or physical capacity. Airports in north Los Angeles County and the Inland Empire are assumed to be unconstrained. The construction of a new airport is a local decision beyond the purview of SCAG. El Toro is no longer being considered by the County of Orange for use as a commercial airport."</p> <p>55. RSTIS process calls for evaluation of all impacts associated with the corridor studies, including impacts on or due to goods flow. As such, singling out and prioritizing goods movement strategies alone in this process would not be appropriate.</p> <p>56. Comment noted. Removal of this corridor from the Post 2030 Long Range Corridors will be considered in the final RTP.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>document.</p> <p>52. Pg. 113 Recommended Funding Strategies - Recommend expanding this section based on more realistic assumptions. SCAG should also focus on local sales tax.</p> <p>53. Pg. 134, Economic Impact Analysis - Paragraph 1 please check for clarity.</p> <p>54. Pg. 141 Aviation Noise - Is it desirable to promote a plan that results in disproportionate noise impacts without discussing potential solutions?</p> <p>55. Pg. 153- RSTIS - If indeed goods movement mobility is a "crisis" (as noted in the RTP), projects that help alleviate or lessen the impacts of this crisis need to be separately identified from other types of mobility projects.</p> <p>56. Pg. 159 Corridor Preservation - The State Route 126 Santa Clarita Bypass is not a likely project and should be removed from the system.</p>	
RTP-04-147	2/9/2004	Tanda, Wayne K.	City of Los Angeles DOT	<p>1. Landuse/Transportation LADOT commends SCAG on the ambitious growth visioning effort, incorporated for the first time in the 2004 draft RTP, that demonstrates the value of land use and transportation planning integration.</p> <p>2. Arterial Roadway Funding LADOT believe that the RTP should include increased analysis of and funding for, arterial improvements. The RTP should better reflect the significant role arterial roads play in the regional transportation network. The RTP mentions, on pg. 88, the "Smart Street Improvement Program". However, we have not found an explanation of this program in the RTP, and our approval of the program is subject to a review of its terms.</p> <p>3. US-101 and I-710 Corridors These corridors should not be identified as toll-road facilities. Neither the City nor MTA has taken any action to support this concept. These corridors</p>	<p>1. The comment commending SCAG's effort on land use measures in the RTP is noted.</p> <p>2. The 2004 RTP acknowledges the significant role that the Arterial System plays in the performance of our multi-modal transportation system. As described in the RTP, Strategic Arterial Improvements or Smart Street Improvements could involve combination of widening, signal prioritization and other Intelligent Transportation System deployment, and grade separation at critical high volume intersections to enhance the flow speed and capacity of the arterial. The 2004 RTP strongly encourages investment in such improvements that are expected to increase the performance and capacity of the arterials for relatively modest investments.</p> <p>3. SCAG's Transportation and Communications Committee at its February 5th, 2004 meeting recommended consideration of the following alternatives for the 2004 RTP in the US-101 Corridor (101/110 Interchange to SR 23/101 Interchange/Ventura County Line) and I-710 (Port of Long Beach to SR-60) Corridor: US-101 Corridor (101/110 Interchange to SR 23/101 Interchange/Ventura County Line)-(a)Potential capacity enhancements</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>should be given high priority for long-term highway improvements, funded by revenue strategies as determined by a regional consensus process.</p> <p>4. MAGLEV LADOT recommends additional analysis to investigate the technical and financial feasibility of Maglev deployment.</p> <p>5. Ground Access for Preferred Aviation Plan LADOT recommends that the RTP include alternatives for ground access that do not depend upon the MAGLEV system.</p> <p>6. Capital Improvement Projects – Appendix I Plan Project List – The summary financial totals, on pages 160 and 161, do not equal the total of the individual projects listed in the section. For example, the total for Arterial Improvements is \$547 million, and yet there are over \$3.1 billion in arterial projects listed. (see comment letter)</p> <p>7. Unconstrained Project List – LADOT requests that their list of additional projects be included in the Unconstrained Project List.</p>	<p>within the existing right of way or requiring minimum right of way acquisition on the segment from the 101/134/170 Interchange to the 23/101 Interchange at the Ventura County line. This will be based upon the results of further consultant analysis to be completed in February 2004; (b) Extensive Transportation System Management (TSM) and transit options, as appropriate, identified in the corridor study, as well as, priority near and midterm TSM and transit options, as appropriate, identified in the City of Los Angeles Community Advisory process for all portions of the 101 Corridor; (c) Continued study of long term east-west travel needs in the 101/San Fernando Valley Corridor and further study of improvements to system connectivity and potential operational improvements to key Freeway/Freeway interchanges.</p> <p>I-710 (Port of Long Beach to SR-60) Corridor - (a) Recognize the I-710 Transportation Corridor (SR-60 to the Port of Long Beach) as a Regionally Significant Transportation Corridor as identified in the adopted Statement of Purpose and Need of the I-710 Major Corridor Study (MCS); and, (b) While additional work is in progress to identify feasible improvements in the corridor, the 2004 Regional Transportation Plan identifies existing commitments to replace the General Desmond Bridge as part of the financially constrained Plan, and the need to provide the equivalent of 2-lanes of additional capacity in each direction to move goods and people throughout the corridor; and, (c) It is anticipated that a Locally Preferred Strategy (LPS), based upon the I-710 MCS (Alternative B-TSM/TDM) and a hybrid of the MCA Alternatives C, D & E will be adopted by the I-710 MCS Oversight Policy Committee, with the concurrence of LACMTA, Caltrans, SCAG and FHWA, SCAG will consider amendment to the 2004 RTP to include improvements as recommended, conditioned upon community acceptance, available funding, and regional air quality conformity requirements; and (d) The 2004 RTP anticipates that additional public funding and/or innovative funding may be needed to fully fund the LPS.</p> <p>4. Phase 1, including feasibility studies and pre-deployment analysis for the Initial Operating Segment was completed in December. Additional analysis will be undertaken this year through Phase 2 with preliminary engineering and EIR/EIS documentation.</p> <p>5. An airport ground access element including recommended ground access improvements needed to accommodate the Preferred Aviation Plan will be included in the Final 2004 RTP.</p> <p>6. Arterial improvements for LA County are financially constrained to \$547 million. The list of arterial projects comprises the input received from subregional agencies for the development of the RTP. The</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
 (Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
					implementing agencies have the discretion to prioritize arterial improvement projects from the list based on performance criteria, to the extent that allocated funding is available. 7. Comment noted.
RTP-04-148	2/9/2004	Wilhelm, Ken	LSA Associates	The TAZ's in the Roland Heights area of Los Angeles County cannot support the residential unit growth that is in the draft RTP. TAZ's (140870100, 140872100, 140862100, 140872200).	Staff has performed an assessment in response to issues raised in the comments. Any necessary adjustments in growth allocations to transit analysis zones for modeling purposes will be made.
RTP-04-149	2/9/2004	Lowenthal, Bonnie	City Of Long Beach	City of Long Beach, in cooperation with many other agencies, is working to develop a locally preferred strategy through on ongoing Major Corridor Study. The I-710 is a regionally significant transportation corridor and should be recognized as such in the RTP. Any mention of I-710 improvements (in the Plan) should include language that recognizes the ongoing study, including that specific improvements will be determined through the outcome of that study. The RTP also suggests that improvements to the I-710 will be paid for entirely by user tolls generated by the project. While that is an optional source of funding, it is not the only source that will be required to complete the improvements and should not be characterized as such.	SCAG's Transportation and Communications Committee at its February 5, 2004 meeting recommended consideration of the following alternatives for the 2004 RTP in the I-710 (Port of Long Beach to SR-60) Corridor: (a) Recognize the I-710 Transportation Corridor (SR-60 to the Port of Long Beach) as a Regionally Significant Transportation Corridor as identified in the adopted Statement of Purpose and Need of the I-710 Major Corridor Study (MCS); (b) While additional work is in progress to identify feasible improvements in the corridor, the 2004 Regional Transportation Plan identifies existing commitments to replace the General Desmond Bridge as part of the financially constrained Plan, and the need to provide the equivalent of 2-lanes of additional capacity in each direction to move goods and people throughout the corridor; (c) It is anticipated that a Locally Preferred Strategy (LPS), based upon the I-710 MCS (Alternative B-TSM/TDM) and a hybrid of the MCA Alternatives C, D & E will be adopted by the I-710 MCS Oversight Policy Committee, with the concurrence of LACMTA, Caltrans, SCAG and FHWA, SCAG will consider amendment to the 2004 RTP to include improvements as recommended, conditioned upon community acceptance, available funding, and regional air quality conformity requirements; and (d) The 2004 RTP anticipates that additional public funding and/or innovative funding may be needed to fully fund the LPS.

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-150	2/9/2004	Rojas, Joel	City Of Rancho Palos Verdes	Growth Forecast: The City is concerned how the population, housing and employment projections submitted during the local review period were incorporated into the projections set forth in the draft RTP. While the draft RTP provides pop., emp, and housing projects on the COG level, it does not indicated how these projections compare with the local input projections provided to SCAG on Nov. 13, 2002. The City requests that a discussion of the comparison between the COG and City level should be provided.	The final proposed RTP will contain forecasted growth at the sub-region level. SCAG will continue to work with local governments beyond the adoption of this RTP to achieve consensus on growth and on potential local implementation measures.
RTP-04-151	2/9/2004	CVAG	CVAG	<p>1. Operation Jumpstart CVAG supports the removal of Operation Jumpstart from the DRTP, because of the flawed justification, outcomes and time lines to this endeavor, and how it unrealistically affects the vision for completed projects and their funding sources.</p> <p>2. Land Use/Transportation Coordination a) SCAG emphasis on the COMPASS smart growth scenarios, does not specifically follow local input, and in our opinion, is not consistent with most general plans and forecasts from local jurisdictions. The need for better communication with subregions and their jurisdictions is apparent, to effectively implement the COMPASS preferred growth scenarios. CVAG believe SCAG should devote time and resources to better subregional coordination and public outreach for these growth forecast strategies to materialize.</p> <p>3) Transportation Finance a) Concerned with the large amount of private funding anticipated for major regional investments, such as dedicated truck lanes and Maglev, and how reliable this source is going to be. CVAG agrees that a fuel tax increase is a needed source of income to fund transportation projects, but questions the surety of this source as well as with Prop. 42 given the state budget problems. CVAG suggests the following initiatives to be pursued to augment revenues: a) Accelerate the gas tax increase implementation date of 2010 or insure the voter approved Prop 42 be utilized for transportation vs. augmenting the state</p>	<p>1. Comment noted.</p> <p>2. SCAG collected local input from jurisdictions, and examined local general plans, as baseline information for this RTP. The land use measures included in the RTP do depart, to some extent, from current local planning in order to achieve maximum efficiencies in current and planned transportation infrastructure. This departure from local planning occurs beyond 2010. SCAG intends to continue the COMPASS/Growth Visioning effort beyond the adoption of the RTP to seek refinement in land use measures, and to achieve mutual benefit for the region and for localities.</p> <p>3. Protecting the region's existing transportation revenues is critical. Page 113 of the RTP emphasizes this very point. SCAG is working in coordination with the region's transportation partners to protect these revenues from being diverted to finance the General Fund. The financial strategies proposed in the Draft 2004 RTP, including the gas tax increase proposal and the public private partnership initiatives attempt to highlight some of the revenue enhancement opportunities that are likely to be implemented over the long term (within the timeframe of the RTP – through 2030). SCAG recognizes that there are significant challenges associated with many of these initiatives. Accordingly, SCAG welcomes further input and coordinated effort to continue to explore these and perhaps other viable near and long-term transportation funding solutions.</p> <p>4a. Palms Spring Airport is forecast at 3.2 million air passengers in the 2030 Preferred Aviation Plan, with 6.25% international passengers. SCAG is exploring the feasibility of including Maglev connections to the Coachella Valley, Imperial County and San Diego County in future studies.</p> <p>4b. See response to comment no. 583</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>general fund.</p> <p>b) Examine assessing increased truck fees, with particular focus on truck weight, weight per axle and VMT, in light of the disproportionate impacts of trucks on transp. system.</p> <p>c) Develop mechanisms to insure that alternative fuel vehicles contribute a fair share considering that gas taxes are not paid by such vehicles.</p> <p>4. Aviation/Maglev</p> <p>a) CVAG supports the "Preferred Aviation Plan" but seriously questions some description details and wonders by Coachella Valley is not included in the scope of this plan. (CVAG) as a world famous destination resort area and with a projected doubling of population in the next 25 yrs., this subregion warrants the inclusion of the Palm Springs International Airport in the "Preferred Aviation Plan" and a Maglev connection to the Coachella Valley.</p> <p>b) CVAG supports the regionally distributed aviation strategy, and recognizing passenger caps at LAX, we question what appears to be an extremely high aviation demand forecast.</p> <p>c) Requesting that a Maglev feasibility study be completed that will examine the inclusion of the Maglev to the Coachella Valley and to the Palm Springs International Airport. With the recent airport expansion and interest from our local Indian Nations, CVAG believes this is an important issue that needs to be addressed.</p> <p>d) Concerned with the feasibility of the Maglev time line and if the next 6 yrs. are credible for the completion of the first let of an operational high speed rail system.</p> <p>5. Air Quality</p> <p>Concerned with the facts that show much of the SCAG region is classified as non-attainment for some criteria pollutants and that large portions of so. California have the worst air quality in the nation. CVAG strongly requests that efforts be undertaken</p>	<p>4c) SCAG is exploring the feasibility of including Maglev connections to the Coachella Valley, Imperial County and San Diego County in future studies.</p> <p>4d) The deployment of the Initial Operating Segment, from West LA to Ontario Airport, of the Maglev Deployment Program is now expected to be completed by 2018. The outlined schedule is fully implementable pending completion of preliminary engineering studies and the EIR/EIS documents. SCAG is currently working to secure Federal predeployment funding both in TEA-21 reauthorization and Federal appropriations.</p> <p>5. SCAG agrees with CVAG that the region must make every available effort to avoid the potential of a conformity lapse, and that all stakeholders within the region need to work creatively toward the timely attainment of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards in all the various air basins in the region. Our analysis shows that the 2004 RTP is a conforming plan. But significant challenges remain ahead of us, as the various portions of the SCAG region move toward the Federally designated attainment years. SCAG welcomes the opportunity to work with CVAG and with the other sub-regional stakeholders in improving the environmental health of the region.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				regarding existing conformity regulations as they pertain to penalties that possibly will be imposed on regional and local governments, if the RTP does not show a plan to meet federal air quality conformity requirements.	
RTP-04-152	2/9/2004	Jonathan Parfrey, Martha Dina Arguello, Gilbert Estrada	Physicians for Social Responsibility - Los Angeles	<p>1. Appreciates all the RTP goals in Chapter 3.</p> <p>2. Page 11. A plan aiming toward last place standards is not only a waste of resources, but also disrespectful to the people of Southern CA.</p> <p>3. Additional funding for HOV lanes and freeway express buses.</p> <p>4. No funding is mentioned for Growth Visioning implementation.</p> <p>5. There is no mention on the role in-fill might play in gentrification and reductions in the supply of affordable housing.</p> <p>6. SCAG needs to take a proactive role in lowering the legal and financial hurdles faced by infill developers.</p> <p>7. Plans to encourage job growth in housing rich communities and the urban fringe raises questions of job accessibility for inner-city residents.</p> <p>8. Need to re-examine how to meet rail and bus transportation needs with less expensive systems.</p> <p>9. Community preservation needs grave improvement. SCAG's public outreach for the plan has been dismal, as evident by the few public meetings announced on the website. The extreme lack of public participation is a violation of public interest and a potential breach of federal transportation law.</p> <p>10. Page 73. The Transportation Safety Plan should include community participation.</p> <p>11. The I-710 expansion has tremendous</p>	<p>1. Comment noted.</p> <p>2. Comment noted. Given the fiscal realities and the forecasted growth of over 6 million people added to the region by 2030, maintaining current levels of service is a formidable challenge.</p> <p>3. The RTP does include significant funding for HOV which serve carpoolers and Express Bus Service within the financial constraint described in the plan.</p> <p>4. SCAG will continue to include the COMPASS/Growth Visioning effort in its overall work program.</p> <p>5. SCAG is not aware of empirical evidence suggesting that specific land use concepts, in broad application around the region, will have a net impact on housing affordability.</p> <p>6. The comment is noted, and will be considered as part of specific implementation actions SCAG contemplates beyond the adoption of this RTP.</p> <p>7. This RTP calls for improved jobs/housing balance throughout the region. Those places that are currently regional job centers will continue to be so.</p> <p>8. Comment noted.</p> <p>9. The 2004 RTP was developed with the support of an extensive public outreach program that reached approximately 5,000 residents of the SCAG region, including many key environmental groups. (About 1,000 people participated in the Southern California Compass growth visioning workshops in Spring 2003.) The outreach program involved more than 200 events, including custom presentations, public workshops and meetings, and several media broadcasts -- more events than were conducted for the 2001 RTP despite a reduced budget. The public outreach effort included outreach to environmental justice, low-income and minority groups, and many key planning documents were translated into Spanish. Even though we are limited by time and financial resources, and challenged by the vast size of our region, we recognize</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
 (Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>environmental justice impacts, has a flawed planning process, a lack of community participation, and a failure to incorporate sustainable alternatives.</p> <p>12. Page 61. Concerned that hybrid vehicles that use less fuel could be bad for gas tax revenues.</p> <p>13. The plan does little to reduce dangerous air pollution in Southern CA.</p> <p>14. The RTP does not go far enough to protect public health.</p>	<p>that we can always improve our public outreach and participation efforts. We appreciate your constructive suggestions for increasing outreach and participation and will make every effort to improve with each RTP cycle.</p> <p>10. Public outreach on the RTP included all aspects of the plan, including safety.</p> <p>11. SCAG's Regional Council is vitally concerned with potential Environmental Justice issues emanating from current corridor study and candidate improvement efforts along the I-710 from the Port of Long Beach to SR-60. In order to specifically address and mitigate possible "disproportionate impacts" of improvement alternatives along the corridor, SCAG participates in the Technical Advisory Committee, the Oversight Policy Committee and the Two-Tiered Community Outreach process that provides direct review and input towards selection of a locally preferred improvement strategy. To this end, SCAG's Transportation & Communication Committee supports a four-part policy position that: (a) Recognizes the I-710 Transportation Corridor (SR-60 to the Port of Long Beach) as a Regionally Significant Transportation Corridor as identified in the adopted Statement of Purpose and Need of the I-710 Major Corridor Study (MCS); and, (b) while additional work is in progress to identify feasible improvements in the corridor, the 2004 Regional Transportation Plan identifies existing commitments to replace the General Desmond Bridge as part of the financially constrained Plan, and the need to provide the equivalent of 2-lanes of additional capacity in each direction to move goods and people throughout the corridor; and, (c) it is anticipated that a Locally Preferred Strategy (LPS), based upon the I-710 MCS (Alternative B-TSM/TDM) and a hybrid of the MCA Alternatives C, D & E will be adopted by the I-710 MCS Oversight Policy Committee, with the concurrence of LACMTA, Caltrans, SCAG and FHWA, SCAG will consider amendment to the 2004 RTP to include improvements as recommended, conditioned upon community acceptance, available funding, and regional air quality conformity requirements, and (d) the 2004 RTP anticipates that additional public funding and/or innovative funding may be needed to fully fund the LPS.</p> <p>12. Comment noted.</p> <p>13. The 2004 RTP's regional emissions conform to the emissions budgets used for attainment demonstration. Therefore, it fulfills its commitment to reduction of air pollution in Southern California.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
					<p>14. See response to no. 13 above.</p> <p>Comments referencing anticipated revenues are noted. Further, SCAG has been working with the region's partner transportation agencies to understand the potential funding implications to the region as well as to discuss possible solutions.</p>
RTP-04-153	2/9/2004			<p>1. Growth Forecast the LVM COG recommends that the final RTP forecast reflect the local comments as shown in table 1 (see comment memo)</p> <p>2. Transportation Investment LVMCOG members identified increasing the capacity of the 101 corridor as the highest priority investment.</p>	<p>1. An adjustment has been made to the forecasted growth for the Las Virgenes Malibu sub-region in response to this comment.</p> <p>2. SCAG's Transportation and Communications Committee at its February 5th, 2004 meeting recommended consideration of the following alternatives for the 2004 RTP in the US-101 Corridor (101/110 Interchange to SR 23/101 Interchange/Ventura County Line): (a) Potential capacity enhancements within the existing right of way or requiring minimum right of way acquisition on the segment from the 101/134/170 Interchange to the 23/101 Interchange at the Ventura County line. This will be based upon the results of further consultant analysis to be completed in February 2004;(b)Extensive Transportation System Management (TSM) and transit options, as appropriate, identified in the corridor study, as well as, priority near and mid-term TSM and transit options, as appropriate, identified in the City of Los Angeles Community Advisory process for all portions of the 101 Corridor, and (c) Continued study of long term east-west travel needs in the 101/San Fernando Valley Corridor and further study of improvements to system connectivity and potential operational improvements to key Freeway/Freeway interchanges.</p>
RTP-04-154	2/9/2004	Letterly, Steve	The Irvine Company	<p>1. The Irvine Company developments in Anaheim, Orange, Irvine and Newport Beach are missing or incomplete on COMPASS maps.</p> <p>2. Large portions of open space are also not included.</p> <p>3. The land use statistics should be double checked since they were not provided with the draft Growth</p>	<p>1, 2, 3, 4 Comments refer to Preliminary Growth Vision as presented at sub-regional review sessions. The Draft RTP does not contain land-use assumptions at this level of specificity. Comments will be noted and reflected in future planning efforts.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>Vision map.</p> <p>4. Major military base reuse projects in Tustin and Irvine are not included on the map.</p>	
RTP-04-155	2/9/2004	Reyes, Ed	City Of Los Angeles	<p>1. Preservation of open space should be the highest priority.</p> <p>2. Moving people to vacant areas of the region has proven ineffective, costly, and destructive to communities.</p> <p>3. TOD should be clearly defined and prioritized as part of the land use options for urban areas.</p> <p>4. The plan should consider inclusionary zoning to create diverse housing.</p> <p>5. Transportation should develop strong neighborhoods; livability should be a performance indicator.</p> <p>6. Transportation facilities should include development of pedestrian routes, bikeways, and transit centers should be seen as public spaces, plazas and a linkage to transit systems.</p> <p>7. Mitigation measures should include traffic calming to encourage pedestrian activity.</p> <p>8. Transportation planning should include easements to adjacent waterways as transportation nodes and areas for pedestrian and bike commuting opportunities.</p>	<p>1. The RTP does place a high priority on preservation of open space, and sustainability was a key principle of the land use measures used in the plan. The plan assumes no future development on protected land throughout the region.</p> <p>2. The comment is noted. The Draft RTP emphasizes maximizing potential for development in existing urbanized areas of the region.</p> <p>3. Plan provides a clear definition of Transit Oriented District (TOD) on page 91. The Public Transportation recommendations include an extensive listing of specific strategies for utilization and incorporation of TOD.</p> <p>4. The comment is noted. The plan does not assume a net effect on housing affordability in the region. However, specific implementation ideas such as this will be considered in on-going implementation efforts beyond the adoption of this RTP.</p> <p>5. The comment is noted. Livability is one of guiding principles of the land use measures in the RTP.</p> <p>6. The 2004 RTP provides a broad framework for the development of bikeways, pedestrian facilities as well as transit centers. However, the design and implementation of such facilities can best be worked out at a local level and SCAG would certainly be committed to participating in this process as needed and appropriate.</p> <p>7. The 2004 RTP does not preclude use of traffic calming as a mitigation measure. SCAG considers this to be more of a local issues that is best addressed at a local level.</p> <p>8. Comment noted. SCAG will look into such opportunities in partnership with local agencies in developing future plans.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-156	2/9/2004	DE La Torre, Birgit		Long Beach airport cannot take anymore traffic, plane or vehicle. Our health and quality of life are already impacted to the limit. Considering that Long Beach is one of the most polluted cities in California, the regional transportation agencies need to look at Orange county and ask them to carry their fair share of the burden. I am particularly concerned about the children whose health, due to their physiology and activity level, are exponentially more at danger then adults. Why are their lives worth less then the lives of the children in Orange county. It comes down to a question of environmental justice!	Comment noted.
RTP-04-157	2/9/2004	Blumenfeld, Jane		<p>1. Pg. 79 - The projection and distribution reflected in the draft plan do not adequately encourage employment growth from employment rich areas to housing rich areas. (See table 1 and 2 of comment letter)</p> <p>2. Travel Time - Table 5.3 on Page 128 depicting travel time variation reduction...has little meaning in the year 2030 because it translate to a mere 0.5 min. of reduction.. There is no analysis on the value or the cost of time. Additionally, the methodology needs further explanation. For instance, it arbitrary bases the individual's choice of acceptable travel time on a level of confidence of 70%, 95% etc. Yet, there appear to be no credible survey on this subject.</p> <p>3. System Capacity - ...it is not clear that increasing system capacity will affect these activities and therefore, decrease congestion and increase overall system performance. How does the operational investment in system capacity reduce the possibility of incidents from happening? How does the forecast of changes of weather decrease the accidents happening on overall transportation systems? Most importantly, even if they do, there is no description of any methodology or reference as to how these relationships would reduce congestion.</p> <p>4. Demographic Changes - Statement that "there is a potential for further declines in transportation revenues from the loss in sales tax as the result of the aging population" is insufficient, from a fiscal</p>	<p>1. While the distribution of growth crafted for the Draft RTP does improve jobs/housing balance, such improvement is not readily visible at the sub-region or county level. Rather, land use measures seek to align jobs and housing at smaller scales of geography along with maximizing transportation efficiency along corridors and in centers.</p> <p>2. The comment is noted and the indicator will be described further in the final RTP. SCAG agrees that the indicator is useful for personal non-home-to-work trips. But it is also useful for local and regional agencies. Note that reliability is a means by which the Region can evaluate the relative success of investments in safety, incident management, and special events management among other. SCAG agrees that a 0.5 minute improvement is not likely to change travel behavior. However, a person driving to an airport generally wants to be close to 99 percent certainty that he/she arrives on time. For the 99% Level of Confidence and an average trip time of 40 minutes, a 10 percent improvement can be more significant (e.g., 5 minutes or more). Reliability is first computed by major origin destination pair and then aggregated by county or region. Origin destinations with high variability of travel time may be candidates for additional investments in Freeway Service Patrol, incident detection equipment, and possibly ramp metering. The aggregate measure for the Region (or County) can be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the overall safety and incident management programs. Finally, this indicator has been researched intensively by FHWA, State and other regions and is in fact an adopted Caltrans measure. References will be provided in the final RTP.</p> <p>3. SCAG agrees that there are many reasons for increased congestion and that reducing or at least minimizing the increase in congestion requires a multi faceted approach. Chapter 4 of the RTP discusses this integrated approach termed "system management". System management looks at capacity expansion as but one strategy that</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>planning point of view. DCP recommends that further analysis of this issue be included in the revenue section of the RTP. Additionally, a revenue analysis of the impact of this demographic change should be provided on a per capita basis, so that it is consistent with the other analyses in the RTP.</p> <p>5. Distribution of Growth - It is unclear whether the results of the Growth Visioning process will be completed in time to be fully incorporated into the RTP. Additionally, it is difficult to assess the impact on the RTP if some jurisdictions accept the results of the growth visioning process and some do not. (see comment letter for table of comparison of no-project and plan)</p>	<p>complements operational improvements that can reduce weaving and merging (e.g., via auxiliary lanes), implementation of transportation management systems such as ramp metering, and travel demand management strategies. However, it is clear that for some facilities, some expansion is needed after getting the most of the existing system.</p> <p>4. The comment concerning revenue impacts resulting from demographic changes is noted. Further information will be provided in the technical appendix of the 2004 RTP.</p> <p>5. SCAG intends to continue the COMPASS/Growth Visioning effort beyond the adoption of this RTP in order to seek regional consensus on growth and land use issues. Nevertheless, SCAG believes that the land-use benefits reflected in this RTP are likely to emerge based on recently observed trends.</p>
RTP-04-158	2/9/2004	Hardison, Gretchen H.	City Of Los Angeles	<p>1. Conformity Analysis - conformity tests should be run for additional scenarios, including the 2004 RTP Update delaying or excluding large projects for which future funding is uncertain, and any other alternatives studies in the RTP. Because of funding uncertainties, tests should be run without the Maglev system or with a delayed implementation date (after 2030) to ensure conformity can be met.</p> <p>2. Aviation, Appendix D-6- (see comment letter)</p> <p>3. Transportation Conformity Appendix E - Clarify whether the data used in preparing the 2004 estimates for population, employment, travel and congestion are from the most recent approved growth forecast process and whether these same projects were used in the 2003 SCAQMP. Indicate the margin of error for each estimate, if applicable (p. E-40)</p> <p>4. Environmental Justice Appendix G - (see comment letter)</p> <p>5. The Regional Baseline vs. No Project Growth Projection for 2030 - The description of "flipping hamburgers" seems to be inappropriate and SCAG should consider terms such as "fast food services" instead. (pg. 35)</p>	<p>1. The 2004 RTP (selected alternative subject to conformity analysis for federal approval) is based on only one set of planning assumptions. Upon the official announcement of the State budgets, SCAG will analyze its implications on conformity analysis and finding of the 2004 RTP and discuss it with all stakeholders.</p> <p>2a. Both the Preferred and Constrained aviation plans included the A380 aircraft in the forecast fleet mix at LAX and Ontario airports. The 7E7 aircraft was not included since Boeing had not yet decided to construct this aircraft when the modeling of the two scenarios was underway. Operations by aircraft type for each plan will be included in the Final 2004 RTP.</p> <p>2b. Comment noted. The Constrained Variation does not include Maglev.</p> <p>2c. The assumptions in the Preferred Aviation Plan were approved by the Aviation Task Force. They reflect a continuation of recent trends, such as increased cooperation by air carriers through code sharing and interline agreements, as well as behavior by high-speed rail travelers. The impact of the assumptions were tested by the RADAM model, which is a behavioral model based on over 80,000 passenger surveys taken at SCAG region airports as well as tens of thousands of high speed rail surveys taken in Europe and Japan. A description of the RADAM model architecture and methodology can be found in the aviation technical appendices.</p> <p>2d. These costs have not yet been defined. They will be specified over the coming year in the development of a Regional Aviation</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
 (Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
					<p>Implementation Plan.</p> <p>3. The 2004 RTP is based on the most recent estimates for population, employment, travel and congestion. The TCM projects in the early years of the 2004 RTP are consistent with the projects used in the 2003 SCAQMP.</p> <p>4. Environmental Justice: SCAG is required to assure that its plans do not create a disproportionate impact on minority or low-income communities. Therefore, our analysis compares conditions under the plan to conditions in the absence of the plan. Other conditions, including existing conditions, cannot be altered by the exercise of SCAG's discretion in adopting the plan.</p> <p>*We appreciate the recommendation to consider other environmental impacts besides air quality and noise and will seek sources of data for future analysis.</p> <p>*We appreciate the recommendation to consider interruptions in service and will seek sources of data for future analysis.</p> <p>*Modeled emissions are based on SCAG's Regional Travel Demand Model followed by EMFAC/BURDEN analysis. SCAG will seek sources of ambient concentration data for future analysis.</p> <p>*Maps showing TAZ boundaries are available from SCAG on request.</p> <p>*SCAG's transit staff and the Regional Transit Task Force continue to seek ways to improve accessibility to jobs and services via transit modes. The expansion of Rapid Bus service in the 2004 RTP will help achieve this goal.</p> <p>*Various uncertainties, including basic growth forecasts of population, household, employment, and their distributions and underlying compositions (income, ethnicity, and ages) are primarily discussed and investigated at a much earlier planning and model development stage. Similarly, emissions are estimated from vehicle class and complicated mechanical/chemical/electrical relationships (as a function of cold starts, hot starts, speed, and temperature, etc.). These were also tested and estimated during the development stage of the emission models. It is very difficult, if not impossible, to provide margin of error information at the regional planning scale. However, it is definitely an interesting and important research area to collect information at sampling sites, compare with results derived from regional model and establish a scientific margin of error.</p> <p>*The definition of air toxics will be clarified.</p> <p>*The figures will be modified to show the same ethnic groups.</p> <p>*According to Census statistics, lower-income persons are less frequent users of the transportation system than higher-income persons.</p> <p>*Accessibility results by income, ethnicity, and travel modes based on</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
 (Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
					<p>retail and service jobs generally show consistent patterns with those based on total jobs. *Highway noise analysis will be included in the final RTP and will be posted on SCAG's web site as soon as it is available.</p> <p>5. Comment duly noted. Appropriate revision will be considered for the final RTP.</p>
RTP-04-159	2/9/2004	Hippard, Colleen		El Toro must be used as an airport. How can you let 12 cities control what is best for ALL of Southern California? Why not in their backyard? It is in everyone else's backyard! Are we placating to the rich again? You should be ashamed of your selves for bending over....	Comment noted.
RTP-04-160	2/9/2004	Lund, Kastle	Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition	1. Increase funding of bicycle facilities. 2. Fund a comprehensive array of projects to achieve a 5% mode split for bicycles. 3. Convene a non-motorized committee to advise SCAG.	Comment noted.

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
 (Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-161	2/9/2004	Yousefian, Bob	City of Glendale/Arroyo Verdugo	<p>1. The RTP needs to address the shortfall of funding for local and subregional transit services.</p> <p>2. Arroyo Verdugo Cities objects to regionally mandated modifications to local general plans.</p> <p>3. Objects to Burbank Airport at 9.4 and 10.7 MAP.</p> <p>4. Recommendation of an HOV lane on SR210.</p> <p>5. Recommends further study on the I-710 extension project.</p>	<p>1. RTP acknowledges funding shortfall across all modes, including transit. Transit strategy proposed in the RTP represents the most effective investment strategy within the realities of existing financial constraints described in the RTP.</p> <p>2. Land Use and Growth - SCAG does not intend to "mandate" any changes to general plans. Rather, it plans to work with regional and local stakeholders to reach consensus on implementing the proposed growth strategy or refinements thereof. Also, note that none of the growth strategies are assumed to take effect before 2010</p> <p>3. Burbank Airport - comments noted about the expressed skepticism regarding demand forecasts at Burbank Airport.</p> <p>4. HOV Lanes on the 210 - comments noted regarding the desire to add the SR-210 HOV lanes in the beyond baseline years of the plan. At this point though, there are no funds to invest in this improvement.</p> <p>5. SCAG has determined that the I-710 Gap Closure represents a significant regional need. The 710 Gap Closure has been included in previous Regional Transportation Plans, including the 2001 RTP. Funding for the completion of the first phase of the 710 Gap Closure between Valley Blvd. and Huntington Drive has been included in the 2002 RTIP and this segment is considered a baseline project to be completed by 2010. SCAG, Caltrans, and LACMTA have committed to assessing the feasibility of a tunnel option for completion of the 710 Gap Closure by 2025. SCAG supports the continued planning and programming of mitigation measures identified in the 1998 Record of Decision regarding the 710 Gap Closure. Plan Funding - comments noted about the need to ensure currently programmed projects are fully funded before embarking on studies for future projects.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
 (Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-162	2/9/2004	Bunyan, Robert	Robert Bunyan & Associates	<p>1. RTP Prioritization of transportation improvements</p> <p>2. Transportation Finance Additional attention on public/private partnerships and other funding methods</p> <p>3. Transportation Finance Shift federal transportation funds from other states</p> <p>4. Land Use Prevent changes that undo existing land use approvals</p> <p>5. Finance Find ways to improve revenue from TOD and high density projects</p> <p>6. Housing Inadequate supply of affordable housing</p> <p>7. Finance Encourage more equitable methods for funding transportation improvements</p> <p>8. Goods Movement Additional emphasis should be placed on truck service centers and rail intermodal yards.</p>	<p>1. Projects proposed in the RTP are based on a set of performance criteria established by the Regional Council and are all considered as priority projects for the region. SCAG believes that further prioritization of the projects within the plan would not add value, rather, it could have the potential of making the process more divisive.</p> <p>2. SCAG recognizes the importance of public private partnerships in transportation development. Accordingly, SCAG will continue to analyze and consider mechanisms for facilitating the implementation of public private partnerships for transportation projects.</p> <p>3. SCAG will continue to emphasize the national economic benefits associated with the region's transportation network to advocate for an increased share of federal surface transportation dollars.</p> <p>4. The Draft RTP does not call for any action that negates current development entitlements or approvals.</p> <p>5. Recommendations concerning municipal budgets and land use policy will be taken into consideration for further research.</p> <p>6. Comment noted.</p> <p>7. Comments regarding equitable methods for funding transportation improvements have been noted.</p> <p>8. Such freight distribution centers are a priority for further study in the region.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-163	2/9/2004	Priest, Todd	BIA of Southern California	<p>1. Land Use Land use decisions should serve as the guiding framework on which transportation decisions are made.</p> <p>2. Growth The distribution of high household growth in Los Angeles should be redistributed to areas that are currently approving housing projects.</p> <p>3. Transportation Finance Subsidies currently going to public transportation may be better used to expand our highway system.</p> <p>4. Transportation Finance The mention of the development mitigation fee in San Bernardino County is inappropriate and should be stricken because this fee has not been approved yet.</p> <p>5. Transportation Finance The development industry, new homeowners, and new businesses should not bear the burden of financing of transportation systems through payment of development fees.</p> <p>6. Highways An additional transportation corridor connecting Riverside and Orange counties should continue to be explored.</p> <p>7. Highways The development of the Foothill South Corridor in Orange County, SR-71, SR-138, and SR-14 is important and should continue to receive attention in the RTP.</p>	<p>1. SCAG intends to seek growth and development consensus together with local governments through the on-going COMPASS/Growth Visioning program. This RTP does not, nor can it, curtail the authority of local governments to guide development through local planning and permitting processes.</p> <p>2. The Draft RTP does not broadly reallocate growth among sub-areas of the region, but rather is consistent with the no-project growth distribution at the county level. The Draft RTP achieves land-use related performance benefits by reallocating growth at smaller scales; centering new growth along transit corridors and in regional centers. SCAG remains committed to providing for transportation needs in all areas of the region.</p> <p>3. Comment noted.</p> <p>4. SCAG recognizes that the development mitigation fee proposal is still under consideration. Nevertheless, it is still pertinent to include such a proposal in the RTP. SCAG will continue to work with SANBAG to evaluate this component of the region's financial strategy.</p> <p>5. Comment noted.</p> <p>6. SCAG concurs. An additional corridor between Orange and Riverside is being currently considered through the CETAP process and is included in the plan as a part of the overall strategy.</p> <p>7. SCAG concurs. All of these projects are proposed in the 2004 RTP.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-164	2/9/2004	Noyes, James A.	County Of Los Angeles	<p>1. RTP The RTP should be consistent with MTA's Long Range Transportation Plan. MTA's adopted priorities and projects such as the I-710 gap closure and North County Combined Highway Corridor should be included in the RTP.</p> <p>2. Finance A transportation mitigation fee, similar to one used in Riverside County, should be considered for the entire region.</p> <p>3. MAGLEV How does the MAGLEV system help achieve the goal of decentralized aviation activities?</p> <p>4. ITS The RTP should indicate the need to provide resources for the maintenance and operation of intelligent transportation systems. These systems should also be extended to improve goods movement and include the installation of systems focused on commercial vehicle operations.</p> <p>5. Water Encourage the investigations of watershed management opportunities as part of future transportation projects.</p>	<p>1. RTP is consistent with MTA's Long Range Plan, including incorporation of the I-710 Gap Closure and portions of the North County Combined Highway Corridor.</p> <p>2. SCAG will continue to explore additional near and long term transportation funding strategies applicable to the region.</p> <p>3. The growth of the region will require alternatives to provide for the increase in air passenger demand. Ontario, Palmdale and John Wayne airports will be developed into international airports and will be upgraded to increase air passenger capacity. Long haul and international service will be distributed to other regional airports, which will be strategically connected to augment a balanced distribution of aviation demand and services in the region.</p> <p>4. The RTP identifies increased funding for operations and maintenance as a funding priority to maintain the efficiency and effectiveness of our current and future transportation investments. ITS is a key operational strategy included in the funding assumptions for operations and maintenance.</p> <p>5. Comment noted.</p>
RTP-04-165	2/9/2004	Petritz, David	City Of Coachella	<p>1. The definition of sustainability "A transportation system is sustainable if it maintains its overall performance over time with the same cost for its users", is an inappropriate definition.</p> <p>2. A more in-depth discussion of Operation Jump Start is necessary.</p> <p>3. The specifics of PILUT I and II need to be discussed.</p> <p>4. HOT lanes should be eliminated from the plan</p> <p>5. No strategy is identified to increase the percentage of energy efficient vehicles using the transportation system.</p>	<p>1. The performance measures used in the RTP were developed in coordination with a technical advisory committee (TAC) comprised of representatives from various transit agencies and stakeholder groups (including the Southern California Council of Environment and Development and the Sierra Club). The indicators developed were then approved by SCAG's Regional Council (RC). Although the points made in regards to the sustainability measure are valid, the TAC decided to approve a pragmatic definition given that maintaining current performance has eluded the SCAG region in the past planning cycles. Indeed, it has eluded most major metropolitan regions in the country. The RTP, for the first time, actually maintains current performance up to 2030 and improves air quality and emissions. Also, note that the health costs of emissions has been taken into account in the calculation of the overall benefit cost ratios presented in the RTP.</p> <p>2. The Regional Council took an action in December 2003 to dissociate</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>6. No strategy is identified by which mass transit users will be able to access their ultimate destination from the mass transit location closest to their ultimate destination.</p> <p>6. No strategy for achieving a jobs-housing balance.</p> <p>7. A connection to the Thermal and Palm Springs Airport should be considered for the MAGLEV system.</p> <p>8. Emphasis needs to be placed on providing commuter rail service from the Coachella valley to other parts of the region.</p> <p>9. No transit "Activities Centers" are identified in the Coachella valley.</p> <p>10. MAGLEV should be connected to other transit options, as well as other anchors such as residential, employment and commercial centers.</p> <p>11. No infrastructure identified in the '2030 Transit Corridor System' are identified as being located in the Coachella valley.</p> <p>12. No infrastructure identified in the '2030 Freight Rail System Improvements' are identified as being located in the Coachella valley.</p> <p>13. The Corridor Preservation Plan does not appear to identify a proposed truck bypass route from Blythe to the Ludlow area.</p>	<p>Operation Jump Start, which is primarily a strategy to expedite funding and project delivery, from the RTP. As a result, all reference to Operation Jump Start will be removed from the Final RTP.</p> <p>3. PILUT I and PILUT II are discussed on page 2, and pages 20-21 of the Draft RTP. It should be noted that these scenarios were preliminary and are described as background for the Draft RTP as presented. The land use assumptions in the Draft RTP contain elements from both scenarios. 7. The land use assumptions used in modeling for the Draft RTP did in fact allocate jobs in closer proximity to housing compared to the no-project alternative. SCAG will continue working with local governments beyond the adoption of this RTP to ensure implementation of jobs/housing measures.</p> <p>4. RTP is a multi-modal plan. HOT lanes were developed as an integral part of this multi-modal system. They present unique opportunities and valid solution to our complex transportation challenges.</p> <p>5. While increasing the share of energy efficient vehicles in the region may be a noble and valid goal, it is beyond the scope or the requirements of a Regional Transportation Plan.</p> <p>6. Comment noted.</p> <p>7. Comment noted.</p> <p>8. Based on information provided by SCRRA, the only future Metrolink service expansion in Riverside County is the San Jacinto branch line.</p> <p>9. Transit centers/activity centers have been identified in the Plan as areas with high population and employment densities ranging from 1,000 to 4,000 employees/sq mile and 3,000 to 10,000 people per square mile. As indicated on Exhibits 4.3 and 4.4 Palm Springs and Beaumont-Banning areas have been identified as activity centers in the Coachella Valley area.</p> <p>10. Several maglev segments as proposed by the Southern California Maglev system included in the RTP connect to Union Station and LAX as well as major residential, activity and business centers. Furthermore, Maglev segments extend to the Irvine Transportation Center, Anaheim and major regional airports.</p> <p>11. The transit improvements identified in the 2030 Transit Corridor System (Exhibit 4.5) are based on demonstrated performance potential</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
 (Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
					<p>of these corridors as collective reviewed and acknowledged by the County Transportation Commissions, local and regional transit operators, and SCAG through the regional planning process. A BRT is proposed in the Coachella Valley as indicated in the list of projects in Table 4.9. of the Draft 2004 RTP.</p> <p>12. A list of grade separation projects, including a number of projects through the Coachella Valley, are in the Draft 2004 RTP Technical Appendix I.</p> <p>13. A proposed truck bypass route from Blythe to the Ludlow area will be studied in conjunction with the Southwest Passage Corridor, which is included in the list of Post-2030 Long-Range Corridors.</p>
RTP-04-166	2/9/2004	Doyle, Bart	City Of Sierra Madre	<p>1. Support SGVCOG high priority transportation projects included in the baseline of the RTP</p> <p>2. Support feasibility study of a MAGLEV corridor in the San Gabriel valley with station in West Covina completed by 2015, and SR-60 Truck Lanes.</p> <p>3. Request to work with SCAG staff in next RTP update regarding high priority congestion relief projects dropped from RTP.</p>	<p>1. Comments noted.</p> <p>2. The entire Southern California Maglev system is included and supported in the RTP. Feasibility studies for the Initial Operating Segment extending from West Los Angeles to Ontario Airport have been completed. This segment covers the San Gabriel Valley and proposes a station in West Covina.</p> <p>3. SCAG looks forward to working with the City during the next RTP cycle.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-167	2/9/2004	Campbell, Todd		<p>1. The social impact and health care costs directly associated with the region's failure to achieve clean healthful air are understated and overlooked in the RTP.</p> <p>2. Cannot understand how the expansion of highways and arterials will promote overall mobility, air quality, environmental justice, and quality of life in the SCAG region. Apportion more funds to public transit and less to highways and arterials.</p> <p>3. SCAG is sitting on a weak foundation to prove that the region is meeting its conformity requirements.</p> <p>4. Important to raise the gas subventions tax</p> <p>5. Risk of losing federal funds greater than the risk of losing gas tax revenue from fuel efficient or alternative fuel vehicles.</p> <p>6. Oppose expanding the goods movement system without adequate and meaningful mitigation measures.</p>	<p>1. While social impact and health care cost of poor air quality are legitimate and important issues, RTP is a transportation plan first and foremost. The plan is required to demonstrate transportation conformity, including meeting the emission budgets established in the State Implementation Plan (SIP)/AQMPs. The proposed plan does meet the Transportation conformity tests.</p> <p>2. RTP is a multi-modal plan. Modal investments proposed in the plan are meant to maximize the performance of the system as whole.</p> <p>3. The 2004 RTP has to comply with the federal and state transportation and air quality conformity requirements as reflected in the applicable SIPs and the transportation conformity rule. The 2004 RTP must conform to emissions budgets established in the AQMPs/SIPs for the SCAB area as well as for any other federal non-attainment area. In the SCAB area, the 2004 RTP conforms to the emissions budgets established in the SCAB 2003 AQMPs/SIPs for ozone, PM10, NO2, and CO; and complies with timely implementation of the transportation control measures (TCMs). The ozone emissions budgets for the year 2010 are the upper limits for the on-road mobile sources as reflected in the attainment demonstration. There are other mobile sources of pollution such as: the air-planes, trains, ships, and the off-road mobile sources (construction equipment, etc.) which are not subject of this conformity finding (the 2004 RTP)but certainly they take part in the attainment demonstration.</p> <p>4. Comments concerning loss of funds from reduced gasoline consumption has been noted.</p> <p>5. Comment noted.</p> <p>6. The 2004 RTP considers mitigation measures associated with the goods movement improvement strategies as an important and integral part of the overall project development process.</p>
RTP-04-168	2/9/2004	Smith, Charles V.	County Of Orange	RTP does not adequately address issues concerning aviation demand and capacity in the southern California region. Lack of aviation capacity cannot be accommodated by the development of a high speed rail system.	Comments noted. Besides Inland Empire airports, airports in Los Angeles County would serve substantial amounts of Orange County demand in the Preferred Aviation Plan in 2030, primarily LAX and Long Beach airports. Serving 30 million air passengers by 2030, Ontario Airport is expected to provide a full service international hub airport alternative to LAX, and reduce the necessity of passengers in the region having to connect with full service hub airports outside the region.

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-169	2/9/2004	Licata, John N.	City Of Corona	<p>1. The land-use transportation link needs more extensive collaborative and consensus efforts prior to including the concept in the 2004 RTP.</p> <p>2. Exhibit 2.3 does not accurately reflect population growth densities along the I-15 and I-215 corridors.</p> <p>3. Designation of the Orange-Riverside County corridor as a toll corridor project is premature.</p> <p>4. RTP needs to recognize projects contained in the "2003 SR-91 Implementation Plan" adopted by OCTA.</p> <p>5. HOV/HOT/Freeway to Freeway connectors are high cost/low benefit projects.</p> <p>6. A north-south transit corridor connecting Riverside to San Diego County along the I-15 is needed.</p> <p>7. Promote full exploitation of ITS</p> <p>8. Consider the costs associated with mitigation measures for goods movement that will address the effects of noise pollution.</p>	<p>1. SCAG is committed to continuing its COMPASS/Growth Visioning effort beyond this RTP in order to build consensus on growth and land use issues.</p> <p>2. SCAG analyzed growth and land use assumptions in response to this comment and found the forecast to be consistent with plan assumptions.</p> <p>3. A new OC-Riverside Corridor is identified as a long range corridor with ultimate project parameters yet to be determined.</p> <p>4. The 2004 RTP is consistent with the OCTA adopted "2003 SR-91 Implementation Plan".</p> <p>5. SCAG recognizes that HOV/HOT freeway to freeway connectors are not cost effective in every locations. Therefore, the proposed 2004 RTP is cautious in limiting such projects to only a handful in the region at locations where the freeway to freeway HOV/HOT transfer volumes are expected to be high enough to make the projects cost effective.</p> <p>6. Although, the RTP does not include a specific north-south transit corridor along I-15, however, the HOV lane project on I-215 from Riverside to San Diego County line, included in the planned projects, will provide the opportunity for operation of commuter/express bus services along this corridor. In addition, the RTP includes a proposed future (post 2030) Maglev alignment along I-215 from March AFB to San Diego County.</p> <p>7. The RTP supports the use of ITS to maximize the efficiency and productivity of our existing and future transportation investments.</p> <p>8. The 2004 RTP recognizes mitigation costs associated with the goods movement projects and are considered as an integral part of the goods movement strategies.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-170	2/9/2004	Pace, Tonya	City Of Montebello	<p>1. Please notify city and residents if regional rail capacity program will require acquisition of rights of way. Any proposed increase in freight train traffic along the UP will require grade separations.</p> <p>2. Need for grade separations in city along UP tracks</p> <p>3. Noise mitigation needed from rail traffic along UP tracks</p> <p>4. Please address the environmental justice issues associated with the rail noise.</p>	<p>1. Comment noted.</p> <p>2. Comment noted.</p> <p>3. Comment noted.</p> <p>4. The U.S. Department of Transportation's 1997 Order regarding environmental justice (see http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/ejustice/dot_ord.htm), and the Federal Highway Administration's 1998 Order regarding environmental justice (see http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/legisregs/directives/orders/6640_23.htm), both provide that activities with a disproportionately high and adverse effect on protected populations will be carried out if alternatives that have less adverse effects "would involve increased costs of extraordinary magnitude." Thus an agency considering whether to implement grade separation or noise mitigation projects for purposes of assuring environmental justice may make this finding.</p>
RTP-04-171	2/9/2004	Pace, Tonya	City Of Montebello	Comments on city's general plan and zoning code update as they pertain to compass. (second 2 pages of pdf document)	Comments regarding the COMPASS Growth Vision, and review of sub-regional vision maps are so noted. The Draft RTP, as presented, does not contain land use assumptions at this level of specificity. These comments will be considered as part of the on-going COMPASS program beyond the adoption of this RTP.
RTP-04-172	2/9/2004	Davis, Thomas J.	Agua Caliente Band of Indians	Lack of consideration for a regional fixed rail transit program that incorporates the Coachella valley and a link to the Palm Springs International Airport.	The 2004 RTP considers public transportation (bus and rail) as critical components of the region's transportation system. Rail projects are considered viable strategies if appropriate population densities will exist to support the proposed services. The transit strategies proposed in the 2004 RTP are based on collaborative effort between SCAG, County transportation commissions, Caltrans and major transit providers in the region.

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-173	2/9/2004	Ritchie, Jim	Los Angeles World Airports	<p>1. Growth/Land Use Concerned that using a policy forecast leaves the Plan vulnerable to the region's ability to implement the growth vision. SCAG has no direct or indirect authority over local land use decisions such as the ones described in the plan. Concerned that the new plan will guide transportation infrastructure investment and decisions where it might not be needed if the existing growth trend cannot be changed. Concerned that the forecast artificially creates a denser market around the remote airports in the region, particularly Palmdale Airport and Ontario, making the passenger and cargo volumes and level of air service SCAG has forecasted for these airports much higher than would be reasonably expected.</p> <p>2. Maglev a) 3 of the proposed Maglev routes originate at LAX. These routes do not seem to support the decentralized vision for regional airport service. b) the RTP indicates that 23% of LAX passengers will use Maglev by 2030. The LAX master plan alternatives do not depend on Maglev serving LAX passengers and proposes ground access improvements and mitigations to ensure sufficient level of service. c) The initial IOS is to be implemented by 2015 and the LAX-PMD by 2020 to 2024. This is an unreasonable timeline for such a complex project and new technology. (Table 4.13) d) ...fares required to operate and maintain Maglev and repay loans would prohibit use for the daily commuters that must make up the largest part of the ridership to make the system viable. e) If Maglev is to remain in the RTP, then the Anaheim-ONT-Las Vegas route should also be included as part of the plan. f) Not clear what justifies using "commuter multiplier effect) which assumes an increase in the propensity to use Maglev for airport access based on the use of Maglev for daily commuting g) The plan assumes that a high speed rail would be used as a means of redistributing cargo as well as</p>	<p>1. Growth/Land Use The RTP relies on land use strategies to meet regional goals and performance objectives to a relatively modest degree. Implementation of land use strategies is assumed only beyond 2010. SCAG intends to continue a cooperative dialogue with local governments to seek land use implementations that achieve mutual benefit. Growth in the plan is focused to maximize use of existing infrastructure to a greater degree as opposed to guiding future investment decisions. The growth in the plan is not broadly reallocated around the region, but rather configures growth at smaller geographic scales to take advantage of transportation efficiencies. As such, regional issues such as demand for various airport facilities is not affected.</p> <p>2. Maglev a) As maximum capacity nears at LAX, rather than relying on expanding existing urban airports, the future demand for air travel will be largely served by using available capacity at airfields located in the Inland Empire and north Los Angeles County where projected population growth will be best served. Using this available capacity promotes a decentralized system that relieves pressure on constrained, urbanized airports and on the region's surface transportation infrastructure. Maglev connections to LAX are designed primarily to mitigate ground access problems to local communities around LAX. It is estimated that about 23% of LAX passengers would use Maglev to access the airport. It is assumed that LAX will be held to 78 MAP by LAWA through aircraft gate constraints. Local passengers destined for other airports in the region with available capacity could board the Maglev station at LAX, but are expected to primarily board other Maglev stations along the proposed routes. Some passengers arriving at LAX are forecast to take Maglev to connect with flights at Ontario or Palmdale that would be unavailable at LAX due to capacity limitations. b) It is recognized that the LAX master plan alternatives propose ground access improvements and mitigations. However, due to a lack of specificity for these projects including likely costs, it is unclear how many of these projects are or could be included in a financially constrained 2004 RTP. c) The initial operating segment of the Maglev Deployment Program from Ontario Airport to West Los Angeles is now expected to be completed by 2018. The outlined schedule is fully implementable pending completion of preliminary engineering studies and the EIR/EIS documents. SCAG is currently working to secure Federal predeployment funding both in TEA-21 reauthorization and Federal appropriations. d) Daily commuters will be able to utilize Maglev. Work trips are</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>passengers to regional airports....No mention is made in the Plan about the motivation or the means of such a fundamental shift in the way air cargo is distributed.</p> <p>3. Aviation Plan</p> <p>a) Based on previous work for Palmdale Master Plan, the forecast for PMD at 12.8 is not reasonable.</p> <p>b) ONT capacity is set at 30 MAP in RTP...LAWA's detailed airfield modeling using SIMMOD and own fleet mix assumptions has shown that the airfield capacity at ONT is between 25 and 28 MAP.</p> <p>c) If the Maglev does not really improve the changes of attracting more passengers at ONT, why is there so much focus on the early completion of that route?</p> <p>d) The assumption that ONT has 17.3% is not well supported.</p> <p>e)...Assuming the growth visioning forecast and consequent intensification of existing urban activity centers, LAX will remain the closest airport for domestic air services for a large population. It is unreasonable to assume that this population will choose remote airports over LAX.</p> <p>f) Our assumption for cargo volume in the ONT Master Plan is about 1.5 MAT compared to the nearly 2.3 MAT proposed in the RTP.</p> <p>g) It is not clear to what extent the impact of the Calif. High Speed Rail Project has been considered in the Plan.</p> <p>h) LAWA will continue to pursue international service for all of our airports to the maximum extent practicable.</p> <p>i) It is assumed that start up carriers would be offered attractive financial packages for initial service, including low landing fees and leasing rate. Who would be paying for this subsidy?</p> <p>j) It is not clear what the purpose is of separating projects included in a Regional Airport Ground Access Improvement Plan and how they would be prioritized against other RTIP projects.</p> <p>k) LAWA has very little control over influencing an airlines' decision to provide service.</p> <p>l) Although every effort will be made to ensure good levels of service (i.e. parking at outlying airports),</p>	<p>expected to more than double between the western and eastern portions of the Initial Operating Segment. Based on market research and travel model trip table for the IOS, approximately 600,000 long-distance daily commute trips will occur between the Maglev station catchment areas in 2025, at fares levels that allow the system to be financially self-supporting.</p> <p>e) The California Nevada Super Speed Train Commission's Maglev proposal will be included as a study in the RTP. SCAG has not been able to include this project as a construction project due to financial constraint standards set for the transportation plan by federal regulations.</p> <p>f) This assumption is based on recent high-speed rail passenger surveys conducted by Citigroup Technologies in Europe and Japan. These surveys show that commuters who use HSR on a regular basis for home-to-work trips will be more inclined to use HSR for other purposes, such as recreation or shopping, particularly if they have purchased monthly passes.</p> <p>g) Like air passenger capacity, available air cargo capacities at suburban airports will need to be utilized to avoid urban airport expansion. High-value and time-sensitive express and mail cargo is carried on HSR trains on a regular basis in Germany and Japan. Similar types of cargo is expected to be transported by Maglev to and from suburban airports and intermodal distribution centers in Southern California, to take advantage of the speed and predictability of airport access that will be afforded by the Maglev system. The advantages of Maglev access to airports for time-sensitive cargo is forecast to increase with increasing highway congestion on the regional highway network. It should be noted that some time-sensitive electronic equipment may not be suitable for Maglev transport due to possible damage by high-intensity magnetic fields.</p> <p>3. Aviation Plan</p> <p>a) The Preferred Aviation Plan in the 2004 RTP is based on an airline "brokering" concept that is designed to remove barriers to airlines providing a wider range of flight offering at airports in the region, primarily Palmdale, Ontario and March Inland Port airports. We agree that in its current stage it is broadly defined. SCAG is committed to work with LAWA and other airport operators, as well as the airlines, to provide further substance and detail as to how this strategy will be implemented over the coming years. Similar to the Preferred Plan Alternative demographic forecast, it is anticipated that substantial implementation of the strategy will not occur until after 2010. Before 2010 a continuous implementation process will be established, including initiation of discussions between implementing entities. The Preferred Plan</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>neither of these benefits are guaranteed at the 2030 volumes proposed at ONT.</p> <p>m) In the RADAM modeling marketing incentives it is assumed that free or low cost parking and free shuttle service from activity centers to airports is available. How would this be paid for?</p> <p>n) The Aviation Plan should have been tested with the ground access improvements that are assumed for the plan as a whole.</p> <p>o) We do not accept the concept that PMD can be linked to LAX via Maglev to serve passengers who originate at LAX (Pg. D-6-19)</p> <p>p) How would the fare structure that integrates air travel and Maglev be implemented since entirely difference private entities would be operating these modes.</p> <p>q) LAWA's modeling has shown that the safety and efficiency improvements proposed do not increase capacity. SCAG is correct in stating that the gate limitations Alternative D do restrict airport capacity.</p> <p>r) The estimated cost of airport improvements for ONT is low. Our preliminary cost estimates for the anticipated terminal and airfield improvements for ONT range from \$1.3 to \$1.7 billion (pg. D-6-24 Aviation Technical Appendix)</p> <p>s) The Aviation Plan assumes substantial subsidies as inducements to carriers and passengers to use remote airports. Assuming this subsidy comes from the airports, they are public costs and should be accounted for in the cost of the Plan.</p> <p>4) Transportation Infrastructure</p> <p>a) LAWA supports the recommendations of the North LA County Combined Corridor Studies and recommends these corridor improvements and other airport related improvements from the unconstrained list be incorporated into future RTPs.</p> <p>b) LAWA supports RTP proposals for increased focus and funding for arterial improvements throughout the region.</p> <p>c) LAWA supports increased focus in the RTP on goods movement and the development of truck corridors and other facilities serving the harbor and airports.</p>	<p>forecasts that about 27% of regional aviation demand will be international, compared to about 20% currently. This reflects a more rapid growth rate in international traffic than domestic travel, recognizing the position of Southern California as a prime gateway to the Pacific Rim, as well as expanding ties to Pacific Rim countries particularly China. Even with LAX forecast at 50% international in 2030, the forecasts of 14.1% and 17.3% international at Palmdale and Ontario airports, respectively, are necessary to prevent the loss of future international service and its substantial economic benefits to other regions. It should be noted that the international forecasts are not assumptions, but are based on the "airline brokering" concept in conjunction with the replication of air passenger behavior in the RADAM model, including expressed air passenger preferences for international airport alternatives as indicated in the RADAM air passenger surveys.</p> <p>b) The LAWA and SCAG capacity estimates for Ontario Airport are very similar, and within the range of varying possible assumptions about future aircraft types, load factors and acceptable delays. It should be noted that since the SCAG forecast assumes a greater percentage of International service at Ontario airport in 2030 than LAWA, we also likely assume a greater percentage of large and very large aircraft servicing the airport, including the 600-seat A-380 aircraft.</p> <p>c) The early completion of Maglev to Ontario is necessary to help relieve LAX, and provide an international airport service option in the region, since LAX is forecast to reach its capacity constraints in the 2010-2015 time period. Even when Ontario reaches its 30 MAP capacity constraint over the long-term, Maglev is needed to implement the airline "brokering" concept at Ontario and boost the provision of long-haul and international flights. Also, a Maglev connection between Ontario and San Bernardino International will be needed for substantial commuter and short-haul service to be diverted from Ontario to San Bernardino International.</p> <p>d) See the response to comment no. 3a above.</p> <p>e) See response to comment 3a above. The growth visioning forecast (i.e. the Preferred Forecast) does not represent a broad reallocation of growth. For the City of Los Angeles, the Preferred Forecast is virtually the same as the Trend forecast in terms of 2030 population and employment (4.31 million population vs. 4.32 million population in the Trend forecast, and 2.22 million jobs vs. 2.17 million jobs in the Trend forecast). For the City of Los Angeles, the primary difference is the greater emphasis on in-fill, mixed-use development in the Preferred Forecast compared to the Trend forecast.</p> <p>f) RADAM capacity analysis indicates that Ontario could accommodate 2.3 million tons of cargo while serving 30 MAP, mainly because most all-cargo flights would occur during off-peak periods, including at night. We</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>d) There is no description of the elements of "Operation Jump Start" in the DRTP making it impossible to evaluate its viability as part of the RTP.</p> <p>e) The need for project to be included in a proposed RSTIS in order to be considered for the RTP or RTIP seems to add an additional layer of approval for no purpose. All projects proposed for the RTP should already be subject to evaluation on the basis of financial feasibility and cost/benefit along with other critical evaluation criteria.</p> <p>f) LAWA recognizes the need to coordinate transportation and airport planning on a regional scale. LAWA is committed to working with SCAG in the future in airport ground access and project recommendations.</p>	<p>agree that Ontario should not become swamped with cargo volumes so as to limit its long term passenger-carrying potential, and that substantial cargo volumes should also be handled by other airports in the Inland Empire including March Global Port, San Bernardino International and Southern California Logistics airports.</p> <p>g) The potential impact of the proposed California HSR system was not taken into account. If it becomes a likely project, such as if California voters approve general obligation bonds to fund initial construction, it will be included in future plans.</p> <p>h) The recent decision by Boeing to proceed with development of the 7E7 Dreamliner was based on the expectation that future travel, even inter-continental travel, will be much more point-to-point than in the past. The Dreamliner will carry 200-250 passengers up to 8300 miles very efficiently, using 20% less fuel than current aircraft. We forecasts concur with the assumption that most international air travel will operate in a more point-to-point fashion in the future.</p> <p>i) LAWA currently subsidizes projects at Palmdale Airport through LAX revenues, since both of the airports are under the same cost center. This issue of how to finance the implementation of the Preferred Aviation Plan, and identification of specific implementation costs, will be examined in detail by SCAG over the next year. This will be done through the development of a Regional Aviation Implementation Plan, which will have ground access, management, and financial components.</p> <p>j) The State of California requires that the RTP must have an airport ground access element. The ground access element will be in the Final 2004 RTP. Proposed ground access improvement projects for each airport were reviewed at a joint ATAC/RTP TAC meeting on February 12, and the overall methodology was conditionally approved at the meeting. Criteria for defining improvements includes the ability to directly improve access to an airport, such as to an arterial leading directly to a Central Terminal Area, or the ability to provide significant congestion relief in a defined airport service area around an airport. Improvements will be ranked in the RTP ground access element according to their impacts using these criteria, as well as according to current funding availability.</p> <p>k) Comment noted. See response to comment no. 3i above</p> <p>l) The modeling assumption for parking is based on the judgment that new airports in suburban locations are able to design new parking facilities with multiple access points and high internal flows. Ontario currently has space to design new state-of-the-art parking, which has high potential for multiple access points since the airport has good freeway access from both the north and the south. It is reasonable to assume that it is in the interest of LAWA to design such future parking so as to maximize parking revenues at Ontario Airport.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
					<p>m) See response to comment no. 3i. above.</p> <p>n) Only those projects from the unconstrained list that would have a significant impact on the RADAM passenger allocations to airports were assumed for modeling purposes. It should be noted that the Aviation Task Force directed staff to model Palmdale Airport with no penalty for route reliability, which implies significant future ground access improvements to the airport. An airport ground access element including recommended ground access improvements needed to accommodate traffic to all airports in the Preferred Aviation Plan will be included in the Final 2004 RTP.</p> <p>o) Maglev connections to LAX are designed primarily to mitigate ground access problems to local communities around LAX. It is estimated that about 23% of LAX passengers would use Maglev to access the airport. It is assumed that LAX will be held to 78 MAP by LAWA through aircraft gate constraints. Passengers destined for other airports in the region with available capacity could board the Maglev station at LAX, but are expected to primarily board other Maglev stations along the proposed routes. Some passengers arriving at LAX are forecast to use Maglev to connect with flights at Ontario or Palmdale when those flights are unavailable at LAX.</p> <p>p) As an example, fares could be integrated by travel agents, who commonly include the cost of the air trip and ground transportation in travel packages. In Germany, some travel agents include the cost of the ICE HSR fare in the total travel package.</p> <p>q) Comment noted. We will include your estimate of the existing runway capacity in the Final RTP, and note that our own estimate of 78 MAP has increased with a revision of the forecast fleet mix to include larger aircraft.</p> <p>r) Our estimate for Ontario was low because we did not assume any major airfield improvements. We will include your estimate in the appendices for the Final 2004 RTP.</p> <p>s) See response to comment no. 3i above. SCAG has not yet developed detailed cost estimates for implementing the Preferred Aviation Plan.</p> <p>4. Transportation Infrastructure</p> <p>a) While SCAG concurs with your premise that more needs to be done than what is currently proposed in order to accommodate the PMD as proposed in the plan, SCAG believes that the proposed improvements in the RTP will provide an acceptable level of service on the regional transportation infrastructure. SCAG further concurs that the projects proposed in the North LA County Combined Corridor Studies (Phase I and II) are good projects and elements of these improvements, specifically, gap closure HOV projects on SR-14 from I-5 to SR-126 and</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
 (Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
					<p>Escondido Canyon Road to Avenue P are already included in the constrained plan. SCAG also agrees that the implementation of these projects will further support the expansion of PMD as proposed in the RTP. However, this study is still considered work in progress and has not been presented to MTA's board for adoption. As such, most of these improvements are neither in MTA's adopted short range plan nor in their long range plan as constrained projects.</p> <p>Furthermore, a Regional Transportation Plan is required by law to be financially constrained. What that means is that the plan must demonstrate reasonably that every project and program identified in the plan will have the necessary funding to implement them within the time horizon of the plan. As indicated in the Draft 2004 RTP, for the county of Los Angeles, we have a deficit of over \$3 billion even to meet our existing commitments without new funding initiatives identified in the plan. Even with the new funding initiatives, Los Angeles County has only \$12 billion. Additional half cent sales tax assumed for LA County accounts for a large share of this new funding, which comes with committed expenditure plan. That leaves the region with very little flexibility to add new projects in the constrained portion of the plan. However, as you indicated, the projects identified in the North LA County Combined Corridor Studies that are not included in the constrained portion of the plan are all included in the unconstrained portion of the plan. There is an unmet need of over \$80 billion in this region. Should the funding scenario change in the next planning cycle, inclusion of the projects in the unconstrained list will ensure the projects are alive for consideration.</p> <p>b) We appreciate your support.</p> <p>c) Again, we appreciate the support and look forward to your continued cooperation in pursuing these important goods movement strategies.</p> <p>d) "Operation Jump Start" is a mechanism to expedite the privately financed project development and delivery through accelerated financing. Subsequent to the release of the Draft 2004 RTP, Regional Council took an action to dissociate "Operation Jump Start" from the Regional Transportation Plan. As such "Operation Jump Start" is not a part of the RTP strategy at this point.</p> <p>e) The policy that establishes the requirement for all federally supported transportation projects to be included in the RSTIS process is established by SCAG in the adopted 2001 RTP. This is done specifically at the request of FTA/FHWA, primarily as a means to foster good planning (purpose and need, technically sound alternatives analysis and community participation) that culminates in the selection of a locally preferred strategy(ies). FAA supported projects are specifically excluded from RSTIS and are developed according to FAA requirements.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
 (Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
					f) SCAG, too, is committed to continue working with LAWA to address our airport ground access improvement needs in the region.
RTP-04-174	2/9/2004	Arnold, Brent	City Of Chino	SCAG's assumptions on population, household, and employment projections are flawed for the city of Chino.	During the 2004 RTP growth forecast local review period (Fall, 2002), SANBAG coordinated with its jurisdictions and provided SANBAG subregional local input to SCAG. Our records indicated that SANBAG provided us the most updated local input on Feb. 7th 2003 by SANBAG cities and its Traffic Analysis Zone. The 2004 RTP plan forecast incorporated most of SANBAG's input including Chino's input up till 2010. After 2010, the growth visioning land use policy measures go into effect and the 2030 long-range forecast may not reflect SANBAG's input. Please be advised that only subregional total, not city total, will be adopted as part of the final RTP.

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-175	2/9/2004	Steckler, Beth		<p>1. RTP might be taking credit for smart growth before land use patters shift to the smart growth model.</p> <p>2. SCAG should take aggressive measures to implement change in land use patters.</p> <p>3. Build regional consensus through growth visioning</p> <p>4. Explore regional land use models. Also, promote transit oriented development.</p> <p>5. SCAG should encourage transit providers to expand service and increase frequency in heavily traveled corridors. Also, street widening should be made to follow a more transit and pedestrian friendly model.</p> <p>6. Increase utilization of Alameda Corridor</p> <p>7. Maglev is misguided; funds should be instead used to improve inner city bus and rail service.</p>	<p>1. The RTP relies on land use strategies to meet regional goals and performance objectives to a relatively modest degree.</p> <p>2. SCAG intends to continue dialogue with local governments and other implementing agencies to seek commitment on interim implementation actions.</p> <p>3. SCAG will continue the COMPASS/Growth Visioning effort to achieve consensus on regional growth issues.</p> <p>4. Comment noted.</p> <p>5. SCAG strongly supports expansion of transit services and improvements in the frequency of service. The RTP consists of several Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) projects that will improve service frequency in many heavily traveled corridors. BRT is designed to provide fast and high quality service, connecting major activity centers.</p> <p>6. Alameda Corridor is carrying more traffic than forecasted in 1999 bond issue. Plans for increasing utilization with the introduction of shuttle operations to an inland port are underway.</p> <p>7. With six million additional people expected to populate Southern California in the next 30 years, mobility can only get worse. Southern California's future economic viability and quality of life depend on its ability to move people and goods. To meet this challenge, a high speed rail Maglev system connecting the region's major airports and activity centers is being planned to reduce the congestion, air pollution, noise and other impacts of such tremendous growth. The primary purpose of the Maglev system is to strategically connect the major airports and to augment a balanced distribution of aviation demand and services in the region. Maglev uses proven and advanced magnetic levitation technology to move people and goods at high speeds with a high degree of safety, comfort and reliability. The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) has made the development of an intra-regional Maglev transportation system a priority in its Regional Transportation Plan. Maglev uses the world's most advanced magnetic levitation technology to safely move people and cargo reliably and comfortably. Maglev technology allows travelers to ride on a cushion of air that reaches speeds up to 310 mph. The train is levitated and propelled magnetically through a propulsion system located in the guideway that can either be elevated or at grade. Passengers and cargo are efficiently transported in an environmentally friendly and energy-efficient manner. Because the elevated guideway can be built on existing freeway and</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
 (Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
					railroad right-of-ways, land consumption and related impacts are minimized. Additionally, Maglev operates more quietly than conventional high speed trains, has fewer impacts on adjoining communities and operation and maintenance costs are one third of conventional high speed rail.

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-176	2/9/2004	Balmir, Sandra	Federal Transit Administration FHWA	<p>1. An established distribution date of the RTP has to be adhered to with hard copies being made available at the SCAG desk. There needs to be more consistency on how SCAG makes the complete Draft RTP document available to the public.</p> <p>2. The Land Use assumptions that will be applied to the 2004 RTP have to be clearly defined in the RTP. It is imperative that SCAG provide documentation of consensus and support from the different locals on the approach to the land use implementation policy that it sets.</p> <p>3. While the document give some indication of the fiscal crisis, there is no real correlation (hard numbers) on the impacts of the Draft 2004 RTP. More specificity is required to deal with the changes that may occur in funding availability and the processes that may be necessary to handle any changes. Please provide the source of financial data as well as the date the source was obtained. Please clarify and address funding for major projects such as Maglev and truck lanes and their relationship to the conformity determination. Please describe the progress made from the last RTP to the 2004 RTP in obtaining funding, specifically for these types of Mega projects.</p> <p>4. General Comments referring to RTP Appendix E – Transportation Conformity: a) A list of acronyms would be helpful. Also acronyms should remain consistent throughout the document; b) For PM 10 area, where there is not a budget, a state should be made as to whether the EPA regional Administrator or the director of the state air agency has determined that the PM10 precursor is a significant contributor to the PM 10 problem. See Comment document for additional comments on RTP Appendix E.</p> <p>5. Appendix I - Project Lists – Please add to the description of the Foothill Transportation Corridor that these are toll facilities. This is significant in terms of the design concept of</p>	<p>1. Draft RTP was released by the action of the TCC on October 2, 03 with the understanding that the documents would be available within a reasonable time frame of two to three weeks. Accordingly, the document was made available to the public on October 23, 03 via SCAG's website as well as by making it available at key public libraries in the region.</p> <p>2. SCAG intends to supply to FTA/FHWA letters of commitment to Growth Visioning principles used in crafting the RTP as well as commitments of specific action to be undertaken by SCAG, local governments, and other implementing agencies through out the region.</p> <p>3. SCAG has been working with the region's partner transportation agencies as well as the State to understand and analyze the full potential impact of the State Budget shortfall on transportation funding. SCAG continues to work diligently to monitor and assess the current budget situation and will provide updated information, as they become available. SCAG intends to further clarify and address funding for the major regional projects including Maglev.</p> <p>4. Comment on acronyms: A glossary (including acronyms) is provided at the end of the Destination 2030 document(2004 RTP), and will be updated as needed.</p> <p>Comment on PM10: US EPA has designated non-attainment areas for PM10 in the SCAG region. The California Air Resources Board has designated the areas for which emission budgets have been prepared and submitted to US EPA. In the remaining cases, SCAG is required to apply a build-less-than-no-build test of emissions for PM10 and its precursors.</p> <p>Comment on TCM definition: The definition of TCMs is provided in the US EPA's Federal Transportation Conformity Rule - 40 CFR Parts 51 and 93 (August 15, 1997) <http://www.epa.gov/oms/transp/conform/conf-regs.htm>. Section 108(f)(1)(A) of the Federal Clean Air Act Amendments list sixteen measures as illustrative of TCMs <http://www.epa.gov/oar/caa/contents.html>.</p> <p>Page E-68 - Comment on cited regulation for timely implementation of TCMs: The correct citation and associated text for the Timely Implementation of TCMs in the case of regional Transportation Plans has been inserted into the Destination 2030 document.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
 (Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				the project and the potential air quality implications. While this may be spelled out in the SCAG/OCTA/MOU, not everyone has access to that MOU.	<p>Page E-83 - Comment on Project # LA962212: This project is not a TCM, and it has been deleted from the Destination 2030 listing of TCM Projects.</p> <p>Page E-99 – HOV project with 2010 completion date is designated as a TCM: Although the HOV portion of the designated project will be completed in a year beyond the first two years of the 2002 RTIP, the project is still currently on-going, and, as such, SCAG is required to report on it.</p> <p>Comment on implementation status of various TCM projects: The implementation status for each of the TCM projects will be reflected in the final 2004 RTP, Destination 2030.</p> <p>Pages 100 & 101 – Projects do not meet the definition of TCMs: The projects cited are toll roads that have been designated as a pricing alternative to HOV lanes, as per SCAG's standing MOU with the Transportation Corridors Agency and as per inter-agency discussions from the Transportation Conformity Working Group.</p> <p>Page E-70 – Reference to the “2004 RTIP” should be to the “2004 RTP”: The error in noted. All references to the "2004 RTIP" have been amended to "2004 RTP", on pages E-70 and E-71, in the section titled Timely Implementation of TCM Projects in the SCAB.</p> <p>Page E-70 - TCM projects listed in the first two years of the 2002 RTIP: The TCM projects identified in the first two years of the 2002 RTIP include, in addition to the TCM projects that are listed for the first time, those projects from the previous TIP that were still on-going at the time the 2002 RTIP was finalized. The text in the methodology section has been revised to read as follows:</p> <p>“The implementation status of each TCM project continues to be reported on in subsequent RTIPs, until the TCM project is reported as having been completed.”</p> <p>Page E-81 - TCM project listing should provide the Start and End Dates for each project listed: The final 2004 RTP will include the start and completion year for each designated TCM project.</p> <p>Pages E-82 & 83 – Can mixed-flow projects be considered as TCMs?: There are many HOV-lane and bike-lane projects which are designed and built in conjunction with mixed-flow projects. In these cases, it is appropriate for SCAG to report on the timely implementation of the</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
 (Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
					<p>whole project, since the TCM portion is implemented in conjunction with the mixed-flow portions.</p> <p>Page E-86 - Status of TCM project: The bike and pedestrian access project is being implemented in a timely manner. The report that it was on hold was erroneous.</p> <p>Page E-95 – Why are grade-separation projects listed as TCMs?: The Alameda Corridor-East project involves a series of interventions to separate the flow of goods movement-related truck and train traffic from general traffic. As the grade-separation projects listed are cumulatively necessary to the effectiveness of the Alameda Corridor-East project, they are, together, considered to be TCMs.</p> <p>Responses to Conformity-specific Comments</p> <p>Comment on page E-13: Duly noted and the language will be added to the end of that sentence.</p> <p>Comment on pages E-14, 15 and 17: Duly noted and it will be deleted in the Final 2004 RTP.</p> <p>Comment on page E-15: The backstop rule, TCB-01, is part of the 2003 SCAQMP/SIP, and is listed in Table 4.1, titled "District's Short-term Stationary and Mobile Source Control Measures" (page 4.7), and is discussed in greater detail in Appendix IV-A (pages IV-119 through IV-121).</p> <p>Comment on page E-25: SCAG collects local input on anticipated growth from all jurisdictions as a precursor to the forecast process. The primary purpose of local input is to inform SCAG on local planning, and it is assumed that locally supplied numbers are consistent with General Plans. The Draft RTP Plan Forecast differs from local input supplied to SCAG in varying degrees and for several reasons. Most importantly, SCAG adjusts the numbers to be reasonably consistent with demographic and economic technical projections. Further, in order to reflect the land use principles, growth was allocated to places where growth opportunities exist, particularly where unutilized transportation capacity is a factor. The majority of jurisdictions (164 of 190) are within 10% of local input for population. Further, SCAG reviewed local General Plans in crafting the land-use scenario, and from this review, we believe no more than a handful of jurisdictions would not be able to</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
 (Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
					<p>accommodate the amount of projected growth under existing General Plans.</p> <p>Comment on pages 26-29: There is, in fact, no difference in population between the no project (baseline) projection and the plan projection. There are however, substantial differences in employment. The plan assumes that various capital projects, especially in the areas of goods movement and aviation, will increase the region's economic competitiveness and provide jobs. It is assumed that the plan will create jobs both in construction of infrastructure projects in the plan, and in permanent jobs in sectors benefiting from increased economic activity.</p> <p>Comment on page E-32: Comment duly noted. Appropriate language will be incorporated in the final.</p> <p>Comment on page E-33: A detailed assessment of the SCAQMD's Rule 2202, Ridesharing, can be found at: http://www.aqmd.gov/ceqa/documents/2004/aqmd/draftEA/2202/Revise dEA/2202_RDEA.html.</p> <p>Comment on page E-46 and 47: The table on page E-42 only represents the summer values pertained to the ozone precursors.</p> <p>Comment on page E-47 and 48: For information on Rules 2202, 403, 1186, and on the PM10 Backstop Measure: A detailed assessment of the SCAQMD's Rule 2202, Ridesharing, can be found at: http://www.aqmd.gov/ceqa/documents/2004/aqmd/draftEA/2202/Revise dEA/2202_RDEA.html. Also, see the SCAQMD's Draft Environmental Assessment of Rules 403 and 1186 on the following website: http://www.aqmd.gov/ceqa/documents/2004/aqmd/draftea/403_dea.doc. More information on the PM10 Backstop Measure can be found in the 2003 AQMP/SIP, Appendix IV-A, pages IV-119 through IV-121. See http://www.aqmd.gov/aqmp/docs/2003AQMP_AppIVa.pdf.</p> <p>Comment on page E-54: Duly noted and it will be reflected in the final RTP.</p> <p>Response to Appendix E Comments Comment on page E-5: Duly note and it will be added to the final 2004 RTP.</p> <p>Comment on page E-11: Duly noted.</p> <p>Comment on page E-25: Duly noted and there will be a discussion on</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
 (Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
					<p>this in the final RTP.</p> <p>Comment on page E-40: The related data was used (built-in) by ARB into the EMFAC Model.</p> <p>Comment on page E-43: Duly noted</p> <p>Comment on page E-5: Duly noted</p> <p>Comment on page E-10: duly noted</p> <p>Comment on page E-19: The Financial Appendix reflects the related analysis.</p> <p>Comment on page E-19: Duly noted</p> <p>Section III. Modeling Summary</p> <p>General comments: Duly noted</p> <p>Comment on page E-22: They are consistent.</p> <p>Comment on Page 25: Duly noted.</p> <p>Comment on page E-32: Duly noted and it will be discussed in the final RTP.</p> <p>Comment on page E-35: Duly noted and it will be discussed in the final RTP.</p> <p>Comment on page E-44: The information and data were provided to SCAG by ARB.</p> <p>Comment on page E-54: Duly noted</p> <p>Comment on page E- 58: Duly noted.</p> <p>Comment on page E-59: The differences are due to data for summer and annual average.</p> <p>5) The description will be revised to clarify that the project is a toll facility.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-177	2/9/2004	Clarke, Darrell	Friends 4 Expo Transit	<p>1. The COMPASS visioning process (pg. 21) is based upon was only a high-level conceptual exercise, not reflecting actual feasibility of adding new dense development into many communities.</p> <p>2. RTP's proposed actions on transportation infrastructure fall woefully short, especially on the critical need to expand LA rail network.</p> <p>3. There is no text about rail transit. Table 4.9 only lists MTA's and OCTA's potential later rail expansions and omits currently planned projects – especially the Exposition light rail line to Santa Monica (shown as Tier 2 on Exhibit 4.5)</p> <p>4. How can freeway speeds improve (Exhibit 5.3) in LA County with such substantial population and job growth and no fwy expansion and small additions to the rail system?</p> <p>5. It is doubtful that the proposed MAGLEV network will be self-funding.</p> <p>6. Traffic and parking impacts are the public's two biggest issues with proposed development projects in Santa Monica.</p> <p>7. The RTP's concluding remarks about \$100 billion of "unconstrained projects" should instead be the beginning of drafting what the necessary transportation network would like to support this enormous growth over the next 25 years.</p>	<p>1. The land use scenario assumed in the Draft RTP reflects recently observed trends in regional development. Development in regional centers and along transit corridors has accelerated markedly, particularly in Los Angeles County. The RTP does not assume broad reconfiguring of existing communities, rather, it assumes incremental change in strategic locations that maximize efficiency in the transportation system.</p> <p>2. While the Draft RTP implicitly acknowledges a significant amount of unmet need in the region, the plan does propose extensive system enhancement within the funding constraints of the plan. The plan implementation will result in significantly enhanced rail network in the region with the addition of East Los Angeles line, Exposition Line, Extension of Gold, Red and Green Lines in Los Angeles County, CenterLine in Orange County and San Jacinto in Inland Empire as well as significant service expansion to the MetroLink system. Technical Appendix I includes a list of financially unconstrained projects that is meant to identify additional needs in the region that cannot be funded in the current cycle due to funding constants described in the plan.</p> <p>3. As explained at the outset of Chapter 4, projects are broadly divided into three tiers, namely, baseline (Tier 1), Tier 2, and Plan (Tier 3). Table 4.9 contains only projects that are in Tier 3, or Plan portion of the RTP for Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside and San Bernardino counties. The listing of all projects, including Tier 1 and 2, can be found in Appendix I of the Technical Appendix.</p> <p>4. Figure 5.3 shows that delays per capita will remain constant, not decrease. Total delay will increase given the increased population. However, through the RTP multi modal investments and focus on system management, the individual is projected to experience the same traffic delays. The improvement shown on Figure 5.3 is relative to 2030 conditions without the RTP investments.</p> <p>5. The feasibility studies prepared by three independent consultants for the four corridors demonstrate that the Maglev system can be constructed through a public-private partnership structure administered through a public agency, a joint powers authority (JPA), or a public non-profit (PNP) format using a number of innovative and traditional funding mechanisms. The construction of the system would be financed through tax-exempt bonds and Federal Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovative Act (TIFIA) program loans that would be repaid through project-generated revenues. No operating subsidies would be required. SCAG is currently working to secure federal pre-deployment funding as</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
					<p>part of the Re-Authorization of the Transportation Equity Act to complete the Federal Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and the State Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the initial operating segment from Ontario Airport to West Los Angeles.</p> <p>6. Comment noted.</p> <p>7. Comment noted.</p>
RTP-04-178	2/9/2004	Johnson, Linda	City Of Anaheim	<p>1. Comments from Advanced Planning Division</p> <p>Comments from Advanced Planning Division relative to land use goals and performance indicators, policies, growth vision tenet no. 4 and Growth Vision Alternative Action No. 3. (Per letter submitted)</p> <p>2. Comment from Operation Division</p> <p>Need to identify and measure the effect of minimizing congestion on water quality.</p> <p>3. Comments from Traffic Engineering Division</p> <p>a. Comment on hybrid growth scenario element no. 3.</p> <p>b. ITS should not be pursued without accompanying financial commitments to manage and operate the system.</p> <p>c. Support Bus Rapid Transit</p> <p>d. High speed ground transportation connection needed between Ontario airport and angel stadium in Anaheim.</p> <p>e. Forecast increases in goods movement would</p>	<p>1. Advanced Planning Division</p> <p>a. Comment about the need for a performance indicator for land use is noted. SCAG discussed the need for such an indicator, but concluded that the other indicators (e.g., mobility, accessibility) will reflect the improvements from the growth strategy. Language to that effect will be added to the final RTP.</p> <p>b. The comment regarding clarity on future actions of affected agencies is noted. SCAG is committed to continuing dialogue and collaborative process with local governments and others on development and land-use issues. No revision has been made as suggested. While SCAG cannot and will not require actions of local governments, some level of voluntary and cooperative action is anticipated.</p> <p>c. Comment regarding "Providing housing opportunities..." is noted. Proposed revision will be incorporated in the Final RTP.</p> <p>d. The comment regarding desirability of mixed uses along corridors is noted. The RTP does not limit development along corridors to vertical mixed use. No specific development types are assumed by the Draft RTP. Rather, the comment will be reflected through planning efforts, including the COMPASS program, beyond the scope of this RTP.</p> <p>2. Operation Division</p> <p>a. Comment noted.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>further congest the SR-91 freeway corridor and BNSF mainline tracks through the Santa Ana River canyon.</p> <p>f. RTP should address provision for increased air passenger service including Ontario international airport and a connection from Ontario airport to Anaheim.</p> <p>g. Aviation strategy should address opportunities for an Anaheim to Ontario Maglev segment.</p> <p>h. Phasing of the Orange County to San Bernardino Maglev should be moved from a long to medium term project.</p> <p>i. An east-west corridor may need to be added to the "Post 2030 Long Range Corridors".</p> <p>13. Comment from Redevelopment and Property Services</p> <p>a. Further evaluation requested as to how to strengthen and protect funding sources.</p>	<p>3. Traffic Engineering Division</p> <p>a. The comment regarding the continued job growth in job centers is noted. The Draft RTP does not assume a minimized role for existing job centers.</p> <p>b. The RTP identifies operations and maintenance funding to optimize the effective use of the existing transportation system as a key financial element. ITS operation is assumed to be a critical component of the increased funding commitments to operations.</p> <p>c. Comment noted.</p> <p>d. Comment noted.</p> <p>e. The RTP recognizes future congestion along the BNSF line and calls for capacity improvements along the line.</p> <p>f. Comment noted.</p> <p>g. The California Nevada Maglev proposal, which includes Anaheim-Ontario connection, is included as a study project in the RTP.</p> <p>h. Comment noted.</p> <p>i. Comment noted.</p> <p>4. Redevelopment and Property Services</p> <p>a. Suggestions for elaborating on the need to protect and strengthen existing transportation revenue sources have been noted. The final 2004 RTP would reflect further detail as may be appropriate.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-179	38027	Cacatian, Ben	Ventura County APCD	<p>1. Investigate what the air quality conformity process will be after the grace period ends and outline the impact in the RTP.</p> <p>2. Appendix E. Page E-7. Ventura County SIP is missing among the summaries.</p> <p>3. Page E-9. Should say, "Draft emissions budget".</p> <p>4. E-11. Bullet point Ventura County, should be, "VCPACD".</p> <p>5. E-78. Remove the italics on the bullet points.</p> <p>6. E-79. A TCM is no longer a requirement for CMAQ funds in Ventura County. However, there are points given to TCM projects during the CMAQ and STP ranking process.</p> <p>7. E-79. The last sentence in the 7th paragraph "See the end..." should be deleted.</p> <p>8. E-80. Under the bicycle and pedestrian heading add a statement that this supports TCM B.</p>	<p>1. It is our understanding where 1-hr and 8-hr ozone boundaries are one and the same the 1-hr ozone analysis will cover both requirement in absence of the 8-hr ozone SIP. SCAG will add language to further clarify this in the final document.</p> <p>2. Duly noted and will be added to the final document.</p> <p>3. Duly noted and will be corrected.</p> <p>4. Duly noted and will be corrected.</p> <p>5. Duly noted and will be corrected.</p> <p>6. Comment noted.</p> <p>7. It will be a separate paragraph. It is intended to guide the readers to a relevant section for project listing.</p> <p>8. Duly noted and the following language will be added at the end of that sentence " ...projects, which support TCM B, the non-motorized strategy."</p>
RTP-04-180	2/9/2004	Carpio, Cecil		<p>1. Protest to the following projects because they directly support the expansion of LAX.</p> <p>A. ID 49160 Arbor Vitae interchange. Draft RTP says this project is a Baseline, but it has not gotten Federal environmental clearance.</p> <p>B. Project IDs: 996390 and 996408, both street widening projects, and both support LAX expansion.</p>	<p>Comment noted. These projects were established as vital projects that would relieve congestion along the I-405 corridor whether or not LAX expansion is implemented. The inclusion of these projects in the RTP was based on collaborative and cooperative planning process involving SCAG and the stakeholders, including Caltrans, LACMTA, and the City of Inglewood.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-181	2/9/2004	Thakkar, Mitra	Riverside County Transportation and Land Management Agency	<p>1. Population, household, and employment all lower in the plan than in County forecasts.</p> <p>2. The COMPASS maps do not have the most current annexations, street alignments and street names.</p> <p>3. The unincorporated land in Riverside County is termed "vacant" on COMPASS, the County feels that this is the county's best area for development.</p> <p>4. Some of the development proposals are unrealistic.</p> <p>5. The land use designations are very broad and do not cover some important uses in Riverside County: agriculture, Indian jurisdictions, open space, and preserving a rural environment. There are also differences between the land use definitions of mixed use, and some industrial uses.</p>	<p>1. In the proposed final RTP, the forecasted growth in both the Western Riverside and Coachella Valley sub-regions has been adjusted in response to this and other questions.</p> <p>2-5. The 2004 RTP does not contain land-use assumptions at the suggested level of geographic specificity. Rather, through, the on-going COMPASS effort, SCAG will work with the County to refine a shared conception of future growth and development. These comments are noted and will be reflected in the development of the COMPASS growth vision beyond the adoption of this RTP.</p>
RTP-04-182	2/9/2004	Peters, John M.	USC Keck School of Medicine	<p>1. Chapter 3. Construction of dedicated truck lanes is said to reduce emissions. There are studies that show faster speeds increase emissions. The RTP should look for better ways to meet international cargo needs that do not have an adverse affect on public health.</p> <p>2. the RTP states that Southern California bears the burden of neighboring states for handling cargo. The RTP should focus on the adverse health impacts of dramatically increasing truck traffic.</p> <p>3. Airports, marine ports, intermodal terminals and freeways all disperse emissions further than just the surrounding community. This spreading should be accounted for.</p>	<p>1. Comment noted. Primary objective of the proposed dedicated facilities for enhancing the movement of goods in and through the region is to improve goods movement and overall traffic congestion in the region. Without implementation of appropriate measures, the truck traffic as well as regular vehicular traffic are expected to degenerate to single digit speeds along some of the major corridors, potentially causing the trucks and vehicles to behave as if they were running idle from the emission stand point. The speed of the trucks and vehicles, while expected to improve, are not expected to be at free flow condition even after the proposed improvements. Speed improvement in this range is expected to have positive impact on emission.</p> <p>2. Comment noted. Expected truck traffic increase is not due to any action proposed in the plan. Rather, the actions proposed in the plan, as discussed above, are expected to reduce the harmful effects of the growth in truck traffic.</p> <p>3. Comment noted.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-183	2/9/2004	Ricks, Rex		<p>Dear SCAG:</p> <p>I am Rex Ricks, a community activist from Huntington Beach who lives under the approach path to Long Beach Airport. I also have contacts with activists in other parts of Southern California who also do not care to handle Orange County's burgeoning flight demand. As it stands now, Orange County only handle a mere 4% of their cargo needs, and barely 1/3 of their passenger demand through tiny 500 acre John Wayne with it's 5700 foot runway. Here is a portion of an article published about SCAG in Long Beach Report dot com that is of great concern to me:</p> <p>http://www.lbreport.com/news/jan04/lgbscag.htm</p> <p>(January 15, 2004) -- In a warning that challenges assurances given some LB Council members that LB's Airport Noise Ordinance will protect residents from increased flights beyond its terms, the Executive Director of the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) has publicly told the LB City Council that if SCAG's regional airport plan to increase air traffic at Palmdale and Ontario airports (TO MAKE UP FOR THE SCUTTLED EL TORO AIRPORT) doesn't pan out, pressure will mount on other developed airports, including Long Beach, to take additional flights. Mark Pisano, SCAG Executive Director, told Council members, "[T]his is critical to you [in Long Beach] -- if we don't find solutions to resolve the pressure, there will be increased pressure -- notwithstanding legal protections around Long Beach today, there will be continued political pressure to use already developed airports."</p> <p>So, I see Long Beach Airport may have to grow since the folks in South Orange County do not want to help handle their fair share of the aviation demand they produce. Well, I'm sorry but a lack of planning on their part does not constitute an emergency on my community's part, or any other community's part for that matter!</p> <p>The election to determine the fate of El Toro was</p>	<p>Comments noted. SCAG does not have jurisdiction over how many passengers use each airport or over the selection of airport sites. We plan the transportation infrastructure needed to serve forecast regional aviation system demand. The forecast is developed in a public process with the input of airport operators, airlines, local elected officials, and technical experts. The resulting preferred aviation plan assumes the airports in urbanized environments (LAX, Burbank, Long Beach, John Wayne and Ontario) to be constrained to their existing legal or physical capacity. Airports in north Los Angeles County and the Inland Empire are assumed to be unconstrained.</p> <p>SCAG's environmental justice analysis shows a disproportionate impact of aviation noise on non-white persons in the region. This impact is almost entirely the result of the noise impacts of LAX. However, by 2030 LAX will be at its maximum capacity of 78 MAP (the level called for in the current Master Plan) and SCAG does not have an alternative to choose that would reduce this impact.</p> <p>The preferred aviation plan assumes the airports in urbanized environments (LAX, Burbank, Long Beach, John Wayne and Ontario) to be constrained to their existing legal or physical capacity. Airports in north Los Angeles County and the Inland Empire are assumed to be unconstrained.</p> <p>The construction of a new airport is a local decision beyond the purview of SCAG. El Toro is no longer being considered by the County of Orange for use as a commercial airport.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
 (Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>strictly decided within artificial political boundaries called county lines. Yet these same Orange County parasi.....er uh passengers cross county lines daily to use other airports.</p> <p>The El Toro election occurred during a low turn out Republican primary in March 2002, and passed by a narrow 4-3 margin. Many of the voters thought they were actually getting some kind of "Great Park". But, at least 20% of the "park" will be developed with housing and retail to help "pay" for it.</p> <p>The real clincher for this "quality of life" initiative is the adjacent 14,000 acre "noise buffer zone" will ultimately have around 50,000 new residents added to it. Ironically, the rallying cry against El Toro was "noise, pollution and traffic". But those problems must be perfectly OK, if it enriches a lowly billionaire developer aspiring for respectable trillionaire status, who then shares the wealth with the local politicians.</p> <p>It turns out a "park" is what had the best polling numbers, therefore that is what was placed on the ballot for base "reuse". However, once Irvine annexes it, they can put ANYTHING they want on it! Now if the voting demographics consisted of Cockroaches, Flies, and Rats, then the "Great Trash Heap" would have appeared on the ballot instead. It was simply all about marketing.</p> <p>What Irvine will ultimately do with the base is one thing, but to have every other unwilling community absorb the region's aviation capacity shortfall as a result, is entirely something else! I certainly would have been supportive of non-aviation options for El Toro, if there was a simultaneous effort to limit development at the same time. It's OK to Suppress Supply, just so long as there is also an equal effort to Depress Demand as well.</p> <p>Here is an example of such actions in balance, the good folks of Marin County who killed future aviation re-use at the former Hamilton Air Force Base, at least had the decency to keep a lid on population growth as</p>	

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
 (Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>well. As a result, they have not imposed a disproportionate undue burden on airports in Oakland, and San Francisco.</p> <p>Also, ETRPA (El Toro Reuse Planning Authority), a coalition of 10 (South) Orange County cities (out of 34 cities) threatened SCAG with a lawsuit because they claimed the demand forecasts for the region were "way too high". Alright then, where are some "accurate" forecasts from these same public servants? As a former math teacher, I am quite disappointed that ETRPA did not at least make an effort to "correct" the "erratic computations" of SCAG.</p> <p>The ETRPA lawsuit basically stated that if the forecast includes "El Toro", well then the numbers must be "too high". But, if the same passenger distribution gets dumped on every other airport in the region, well then, the numbers are "just right"! That is a Goldilocks Mentality!</p> <p>So it appears the odds are great, that the unwilling communities of Burbank, March, LAX, and Long Beach may now be on the hook to make up the difference in Orange County's aviation and cargo shortfall. Well, since South Orange County will likely get away with adding OMAP in capacity, then it's only fair that every other community (opposing airport growth) should have that option as well!</p> <p>If 0 MAP growth is not an option for others as well, then this is certainly a textbook case of economic and environmental injustice! That's because South Orange County happens to have some of the wealthiest and whitest communities in Southern California, if not the nation! If SCAG chooses to proceed without El Toro, then there must be an equitable voice for all the other communities who want no further burden as well. After all, a precedent has now been set, by letting Orange County off the hook.</p> <p>-Rex Ricks</p>	

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
 (Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTP-04-184	2/9/2004	Gabelich, Rae		<p>I am a taxpayer and homeowner in Long Beach, California. I urge the proposed SCAG Regional Transportation Plan for 2030 be amended to specify measures that will ultimately result in attainment of federally mandated clean air standards. It is a disservice to the region for anyone within SCAG to publicly propose less. SCAG's recently released Regional Report Card shows the counter-productive results of inviting impacts that harmed the region's quality of life.</p> <p>Growth is good, but balance should be mandatory. Two entities of the City of Long Beach are cause for concern. The Port of Long Beach, and its associated transportation impacts, have been identified by the South Coast Air Quality Management District as among the region's worst pollution sources. To my knowledge, not one current official of the City of Long Beach has even suggested that the city's Port and its associated transportation sources reduce the pollution they generate to the point where the region can attain current federal clean air standards.</p> <p>Increased operations at Long Beach's city-owned airport also make it harder for the region to attain federal clean air standards. No other area airport is located as close to the Ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles, their pollution and their related traffic impacts. No other airport has been invited to grow as fast by the reckless invitation of local officials despite being surrounded by densely populated residential areas, schools, parks and shopping centers.</p> <p>SCAG's draft Regional Transportation Plan recognizes that 3.8 million annual passengers at Long Beach Airport reflects the level provided by the city's airport ordinance (a measure that has been upheld by a federal court). However, I take exception to a recent statement by SCAG's Executive Director at the January 13, 2004 Long Beach City Council meeting in which he indicated that if SCAG's regional airport plan doesn't work as planned, "there will be increased pressure -- notwithstanding legal protections around</p>	<p>Air quality-related comments: The Draft 2004 RTP successfully demonstrates conformity with the region's 2003 Air Quality Management Plan and State Implementation Plan. The challenges facing the region, over the next few years, are substantial, and will require the active participation of all stakeholders in shaping the regional consensus that will move the region into attainment of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards.</p> <p>The category of mobile sources includes both on-road and off-road mobile sources, such as automobiles and transit vehicles, as well as marine vessels, aircraft and trains. All of these sources are reflected in the 2003 AQMP/SIP. However, although seaport and airport emissions are mobile sources, the 2004 RTP is responsible only for the on-road portion of the mobile sources.</p> <p>For additional response relative to Air Quality issues, refer to SCAG's response to Comment No. 646 response to no. 3, as well.</p> <p>Airport-related comments are duly noted.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
(Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>Long Beach today -- there will be continued political pressure to use already developed airports."</p> <p>Not one Long Beach City Council member responded to this statement when it was made. My response is straightforward. I regard the statement as harmful to the interests of the City of Long Beach, its laws, its residents, their homes, their families, their neighborhoods...and ultimately harmful to the region. I believe one does not serve the region in the 21st century by making its livable parts less livable.</p> <p>I again urge the proposed SCAG Regional Transportation Plan for 2030 be amended to specify measures that will ultimately result in attainment of federally mandated clean air standards as impacted by 710 freeway expansion and Port and Airport operations.</p>	
RTP-04-185	2/9/2004	Smith, Charles V.	County Of Orange	<p>February 9, 2004</p> <p>Bernice Villanueva Southern California Association of Governments 818 West 7th Street, 12th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90017</p> <p>Subject: Comments concerning the 2004 Draft Regional Transportation Plan</p> <p>The 2004 Draft RTP (Draft) does not adequately address issues concerning aviation demand and capacity in the southern California region. The Draft fails to account for, nor mitigate the profound impacts on the southern California region of not meeting projected air passenger and cargo demand over the next 25 years. More over, the attempt by SCAG to artificially stimulate and manipulate passenger demand to be satisfied at outlying airports via high-speed rail is at best speculative, impractical and economically unsound.</p> <p>Unfortunately, with the conversion of MCAS El Toro</p>	<p>Comments noted. Besides Inland Empire airports, airports in Los Angeles County would serve substantial amounts of Orange County demand in the Preferred Aviation Plan in 2030, primarily LAX and Long Beach airports. Serving 30 million air passengers by 2030, Ontario Airport is expected to provide a full service international hub airport alternative to LAX, and reduce the necessity of passengers in the region having to connect with full service hub airports outside the region.</p>

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
 (Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>having been taken off the table, this has left a huge hole in southern California's aviation system. Combined, El Toro and John Wayne airports were slated to serve a combined 30 million annual passengers and almost 2 million tons of air cargo. The previous RTP's approach required Orange County and the Inland Empire to accommodate its own demand within the region to insure conformity.</p> <p>With the passage of Measure W and the loss of El Toro for aviation purposes, the Draft proposes to move Orange County's demand (other than what can be served by John Wayne Airport) out to the Inland Empire. However, the Draft is deficient on details for mitigating the increased traffic and emissions generated by this approach. For example, there is scant mention of solutions for accommodating Orange and San Diego counties air cargo demand, nor the inclusion of measures that will attempt to mitigate the traffic and emissions that will be generated by a tripling of air cargo tonnage traveling north on Interstate 5 and 405 through Orange County to Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) and north on Interstate 15 to Ontario International Airport (ONT). The Draft stipulates that Orange County generates over 30% of the region's air cargo tonnage and that San Diego is reliant on LAX and ONT for the overwhelming majority of that county's air cargo. However, there is minimal mention of how to either reduce the number of trucks and their emissions, as well as shorten the distance traveled to accommodate this demand.</p> <p>Furthermore, the over-reliance on and the faulty premise of a high speed rail system that, "...will ultimately facilitate the development of a regional airport system..." (Draft-p.104) does not adequately address the impacts of failing to meet southern California's air passenger demand. It is irresponsible for SCAG to intimate that the region's lack of aviation capacity, specifically in Orange County can be accommodated by the development of an extremely costly and speculative high speed rail system that perpetuates the necessity for travelers to travel by car</p>	

Response to Comments
Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan
 (Updated 4/6/2004)

APPENDIX H • Public Outreach

Rcd. ID #	Commt. Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				<p>and catch a train to an outlying airport to then fly to catch a connection to their desired destination. The reality is two-fold: 1) passengers will be forced to use our regional airports to connect to a full-service facility outside our region in order to accommodate their air travel needs, or 2) they will continue to over burden LAX and our ground transportation system in and around, to and from LAX. In either scenario, the Draft represents a failure at creating a decentralized system and a loss in economic output to the entire region.</p> <p>The bottom line relative to aviation travel as Herb Kelleher so aptly coined, "People want to fly from somewhere to somewhere, not from somewhere to nowhere to get to somewhere." This draft fails to acknowledge or aptly mitigate the realities of not accommodating air passenger and cargo demand in the southern California region.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Charles V. Smith Member, Orange County Board of Supervisors Member, Orange County Transportation Authority Member, Southern California Association of Governments</p>	